DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 057 714 HE 002 624

TITLE	Report of the Committee on the Status of Women in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences.
INSTITUTION	Harvard Univ., Cambridge, Mass. Faculty of Arts and Sciences.
PUB DATE	Apr 71
NOTE	100p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Careers; *College Students; Day Care Services; Employment Patterns; *Faculty; Females; Graduate Study; *Higher Education; Institutional Environment; *Social Discrimination; *Women Professors

ABSTRACT

This carefully prepared document contains seven chapters: Women at Harvard: the Present Situation in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences, Career Patterns and Academic Commitment, Women on the Faculty, Women in the Graduate School, A Note on Undergraduate Life, University Services, and a Summary of Proposals. Several of the sources for this work include: open hearings, detailed inquiries to department chairmen, interviews with faculty women, questionnaires to past and present graduate students and several University offices. The first chapter details the past and current standing of women faculty and students at Harvard. The absence of women on the faculty, their concentration in off-ladder positions, and their general feelings of isolation are the three most notable areas of concern. For women graduate students, although the statistics show a pattern of equitable treatment, the questionnaires reveal women students do encounter prejudice. Chapter two explores career patterns in terms of both social roles and institutional structure. Chapters three and four specify explicit recommendations for reforms relating to faculty and graduate students. Chapter five explores the implications the Committee's work should have on undergraduate education. Day care and health care are the major focal points in Chapter six. Chapter seven contains a summary of 24 proposals that evolved from the Committee's work. Supporting data appear in the appendices. (LR)

ED057714

FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES
HARVARD UNIVERSITY

Report of the Committee on the Status of Women In the Faculty of Arts and Sciences

APRIL, 1971

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE002 624

This report has been printed for circulation to members of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences and others who may wish to consider its contents. This circulation is solely to facilitate discussion, and should not be construed to indicate acceptance of the views stated in this Report by the Faculty, by the President, or by the Governing Boards.

PREFACE TO THE DEAN OF THE FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

Sir:

In April of 1970, you invited us to study the status of women on the Harvard Faculty. You specifically asked us:

(a) To review and report on the facts regarding the participation of women in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences;

(b) To explore ways under existing policies where that participation might be increased through the administration of recruitment, appointment, and promotion policies;

(c) To review ways in which the participation of women might be increased by alterations in our policies and procedures;

(d) To explore more generally as a setting for the above proposals the problems of careers for women in educational and professional activities.

We have interpreted the four parts of our charge as requiring us to investigate the status and problems of women graduate students as well as faculty members at Harvard. With your agreement, this past Fall, we associated with ourselves a committee of five graduate women, selected by us, two of whose members were recommended to us by the Graduate Women's Organization. The broader study in which they have assisted us is necessary, we believe, both because the graduate school is a major source from which the Faculty is recruited and because we can hardly understand the careers women pursue in the academic world without looking at the training and guidance they receive.

It did not lie within our charge to investigate the problems of women holding administrative posts, serving in the university's libraries and museums, working at the University Press, and so on. We did receive letters from some of these women; a number

of them spoke at our open hearings. What they told us is in part public information; in part it must remain confidential. Without having attempted a study of our own, we cannot evaluate what we read and heard. But we must report that a considerable amount of discontent exists among these women, and we strongly urge that you seek to establish a committee of representatives of these professional positions (curators, research librarians, deans, administrative assistants, etc.) and faculty members to study the position of women employed by the Corporation but not holding faculty appointments. We understand that a study of Salary and Wage personnel is already underway and hope that its results will shortly be made public and that women in these positions will be consulted about the solution to any inequities discovered.

While we have been at work, Harvard University was specifically charged by the federal government with discrimination against women and required to present an "affirmative action plan" designed to establish equal employment opportunity for women at all levels of the University. Such a plan was filed with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare and accepted by it during February of this year. As you know, we were not involved in any way in the working out of that plan and have not yet seen a complete draft of it. We have made our proposals in terms of what we take to be the intrinsic standards of a community of scholars, teachers, and students and without reference to external pressure. We are not unwilling, however, to see the University brought under some pressure from the federal government in the name of equal opportunity, and we were glad to see the work of our committee included in the University's description of its "affirmative action."

Our work has proceeded more slowly than we had hoped: there were many people who wished to be heard, and the information that we needed was not always easy to gather. During the months of October and November, 1970, we held open hearings on Friday afternoons at the Faculty Club; over fifty people testified on a great variety of topics relevant to the status of women at Harvard. We addressed detailed inquiries to all department chairmen under the Faculty of Arts and Sciences and received detailed responses from the great majority of them. We interviewed every woman presently holding a regular Faculty appointment and a large number of those who serve as

lecturers and research associates. In an effort to collect information about the experience of women graduate students, their career expectations, and their actual achievements, we mailed out questionnaires to all women presently enrolled in the graduate school (and to one-third of the men) and also to all members, male and female, of the entering graduate classes of 1950, 1957, and 1964. We have also consulted frequently and at length with administrative officials and are grateful for the extensive help we have received from your own office, the Dean of the Graduate School and his associates, the Registrar, the Graduate Alumni Office, the Office of Tests, and the Radcliffe Institute.

The report that we herewith submit is unanimously endorsed by our committee and by the associated graduate student committee.

Morton W. Bloomfield
Dudley R. Herschbach
Lynn Moorhead Riddiford
Emily Townsend Vermeule

Caroline Walker Bynum, *Co-Chairman*
Michael Laban Walzer, *Co-Chairman*

Graduate Student Consulting Committee

Lucy Schneider McDiarmid
Ann Norris Michelini
Vicki L. Sato
Maria Fleming Tymoczko
Shirley Weitz

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Preface	iii
I	Women at Harvard: The Present Situation in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences	1
II	Career Patterns and Academic Commitment	21
III	Women on the Faculty	29
IV	Women in the Graduate School	46
V	A Note on Undergraduate Life	57
VI	University Services	61
VII	Summary of Proposals	68
	Appendices	73

STATISTICAL TABLES

The following tables can be found in Appendix 1:

I Women in Selected Corporation Appointments Under the Faculty of Arts and Sciences: March, 1969–70; December, 1970–71

II Harvard University Officers, Male and Female Appointments: 1959–60; 1968–69

III Women in the Harvard Graduate School of Arts and Sciences: Applications, Admissions, Registered Students, Teaching Fellows, and Ph.D. Recipients: 1959–60; 1968–69

IV Female Applicants, Admissions and Entrants to the Harvard Graduate School of Arts and Sciences: 1967; 1968; 1969 (Three Year Totals)

V Female Scholarship Recipients Among Entering Students in The Graduate School of Arts and Sciences: 1967; 1968; 1969 (Three Year Average)

VI Women Holding Teaching Fellowships: 1970–71

VII Male and Female Teaching Fellows: Tenths of Time Employed by Fields: 1970–71

VIII Median Number of Years Elapsing Between B.A. and Receipt of Ph.D.: 1950–1954; 1960–1964; 1965–1967

IX Ratio of Ph.D.'s Awarded to Graduate Enrollment by Sex, by Department and Area: Harvard Graduate School of Arts and Sciences: 1965; 1966; 1967 (Three Year Average)

X Male and Female House Tutors: 1970–71

I

WOMEN AT HARVARD: THE PRESENT SITUATION IN THE FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

Faculty

The number of women on the Harvard Faculty of Arts and Sciences is very small. One has only to look around at faculty meetings to discover that. Moreover, the women who do hold faculty appointments are concentrated in the non-tenured ranks and in "exceptional" or off-ladder appointments (see Table I). Women are about 17% of the lecturers in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences and about 13% of the research associates and fellows. They are only about 6% of the assistant professors and are virtually absent at the upper ranks of the regular faculty. This situation has not changed very much in the last ten years. It is slightly encouraging to find two female tenured professors in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences in the fall of 1970 whereas the spring of 1970 found none; but one of these holds an endowed chair reserved for women (which was vacant last year) and the other was a member of the Harvard faculty last year but in an off-ladder appointment. Ten years ago there were also two female tenured professors. Furthermore, the number of female assistant professors in the fall of 1970 (11) is not much greater than the number in the fall of 1969 (10). There have been new appointments, but they have in general only replaced women who were leaving. In the University as a whole, the statistics are very similar, and the picture of the sixties reveals, if anything, a decline (see Table II). Although the total number of regular tenured appointments rose from 550 to 731 between 1959–60 and 1968–69, the number of women in regular tenured positions fell from 12 to 11. Although the number and percentage of women assistant professors rose (from 3.9% to 4.2%) in the sixties, the over-all percentage of women in junior faculty

appointments (instructorships and assistant professorships) fell slightly (from 7.7% to 7.2%). Differences of a few tenths of a percentage point are not significant; what is significant is the lack of improvement at the junior faculty level, despite the fact that the percentage of women among those receiving Ph.D.'s crept up nationally in the late fifties and sixties (from 9% in 1954 to almost 13% in 1968) and doubled at Harvard between 1959–60 and 1968–69 (from 9.6% to 19.0%).

The situation at Harvard is only slightly worse than that at other major universities. At the University of Chicago in the spring of 1969, 11 out of 475 full professors were women, 16 out of 217 associate professors, 16 out of 308 assistant professors, and 15 out of 102 instructors. At Berkeley in the spring of 1970, 2% of all full professors, 5% of all associate professors, and 5% of all assistant professors were women.

These very low percentages do not seem to be explained by the fact that women are not employed in academic jobs. In the spring of 1963 (the most recent date for which full national figures are available), women comprised 18% of the full-time teaching faculty in universities and four-year colleges and 22% of the faculty and professional staff, although at no time in the period between 1948 and 1968 did women receive over 13% of the Ph.D.'s granted nationally. (The 1969 Report of the National Center for Educational Statistics [Office of Education, HEW] indicates that in the fall of 1967 the situation had not changed.) But women do not distribute among American colleges and universities in the same pattern as men. They tend to be employed in colleges rather than universities and in low rather than high status institutions; they tend to be located in the non-tenured ranks, or in off-ladder or subprofessional appointments. In 1963, 23% of the faculties of colleges were women, but only 13% of the faculties of universities; 11% of the faculties of large universities (750 faculty members or more) were women, but 14% of the faculties of small universities; 29% of the instructors in all colleges and universities were women, 21% of the assistant professors, 15% of the associate professors, 8% of the full professors, but 37% of those in "other" categories. More recent studies of individual professions suggest the same pattern. Alice Rossi reports that in 1968–69, 30% of the Ph.D.'s in sociology went to women, but only 1% of full professors in sociology in the top graduate schools were female; 39% of "subprofessional"

appointees, such as research associates, were women. A study of the political science profession in 1969 indicated that 76% of the colleges and universities that have women on the faculty were in the "small department" category (0–15). A study conducted by the American Historical Association in 1970 showed that women were only 1–2% of the history faculties in the top ten universities. It suggested, moreover, that the percentage of women in history departments of good coeducational liberal arts colleges was declining, although female participation was still about 10% in 1970. It also found that women historians were chiefly in the non-tenured ranks. In the M.I.T. Symposium on American Women in Science and Engineering, Alice Rossi writes that "the number of women in various scientific and engineering fields [both academic and non-academic] has increased, but at a rate so much lower than that for men that the proportion of women in the fields is lower in 1960 than in 1950." She suggests that in industrial engineering, the only field in which there has been an increase, women may be replacing men at the lower levels while the upper reaches of the field expand and are filled by men.

Not only is the national distribution of women Ph.D.'s in job categories different from that of men, the history of women Ph.D.'s is different also. The overall number of Ph.D.'s granted nationally has risen fairly steadily from 382 in 1900 to 3,290 in 1940, and (except for a decline in the years of World War II) to 23,191 in 1968. The general participation of women in the labor force has also risen. But the percentage of women earning Ph.D.'s in the 1920's and 1930's (15% in 1920, 15% in 1930–38) has never again been equalled, and the percentage of women among faculty and professional staff in four-year colleges and universities is not much greater in 1963–64 (23%) than it was in 1900 (20%) and substantially lower than in the 1930's (29% in 1931–32, 28% in 1933–40). Moreover, men and women who held full-time teaching positions in universities and four-year colleges in 1963 were characterized by very different career patterns and life styles. Two-thirds of the men but only one-half of the women were 30 to 40 years of age; 86% of the men but only 31% of the women were married with spouse present; 57% of the women but only 12% of the men had never been married; 81% of the women faculty had no children whereas only 32% of the men were childless.

The small number of women on the Harvard faculty in the 1960's is therefore part of a national pattern. The explanations which have been offered for this pattern are varied and complex. Sociologists and psychologists have discussed the fear of success felt by many women, and their "internal ambivalences" toward combining family and career. Women themselves have frequently charged prejudice, a charge which is given some support by the recent research of Lawrence Simpson (unpublished dissertation, Pennsylvania State University, 1969), by the anecdotal evidence cited in the report of the Subcommittee on the Status of Academic Women at Berkeley, and by anecdotal evidence collected at our own hearings and interviews. Many men and women point to the obvious fact that, even without "internal ambivalences," combining family and a career often creates special problems for women. (This fact surely lies behind the relatively smaller percentage of women academics in the age group 30 to 40 and the very much larger percentage of women academics who are childless.)

The one explanation that appears to have been disproved by recent research is the theory that women do not choose to utilize their professional training. Helen Astin in *The Woman Doctorate in America*, shows that 91% of the women receiving doctorates in all fields in 1957–58 were employed in 1964 and 79% of them had not interrupted their careers in the interval. Similarly, the theory that women fail to publish and therefore fail to gain promotion is at least questioned by the research of Simon, Clark and Galway, which shows that married women Ph.D.'s who are employed full time publish slightly more than either male Ph.D.'s or unmarried female Ph.D.'s. The idea that there are no women available for first-rate academic positions is belied by the fact that at Princeton this year 20% (10) of the new appointments went to women. As Bunting, Graham and Wasserman pointed out in the *Educational Record* (Fall, 1970), "the appointment of these women scholars was accomplished by only minimal changes in recruiting, although throughout the institution's more than 200-year history only three women had ever held appointments in the professorial ranks."

If we turn from the numbers of women at Harvard to the situation of those women who are here, the facts are more encouraging. Since Harvard salaries are fixed in amount for each regular faculty rank (assistant, associate and full professor),

we have discovered no case of a woman in a regular faculty appointment who is paid less than her male counterpart. A study of salary data for irregular faculty appointments (lecturers and research appointments) indicates that salaries in these ranks are determined not by sex but by age, length of service and division within the university (salaries in the Humanities are lower than in the Natural Sciences). Moreover, we have discovered in interviews with women faculty members that the university has been generous in allowing unpaid maternity leave and, in the case of faculty members in irregular appointments, flexible about arranging for part-time work. Some of the women in regular faculty positions seem to carry unusually heavy burdens of administrative work within their departments and the university, but this is at least in part because of the university's commendable desire to include women in the decision-making process. Some of the women lecturers carry exceptionally heavy teaching loads, but this is because of the large number of women in the category of language-teacher. In general, Harvard has not required more work from women in a given job category than from men and has avoided the abuses connected with a "star salary system" — abuses which are unfortunately all too common in other universities.

We must insist, however, that the large percentage of women in the lecturer and research associate and fellow category is in itself a serious abuse, even if it is an unintentional one. The lectureship is a useful way of providing flexibility both for the university and for the individuals who hold it, a way of bringing to Harvard men and women whose training is non-academic or whose career pattern is unconventional. The research associate and research fellow positions provide valuable professional experience for young scholars in the sciences and social sciences who are beginning their careers. Such positions have in the past been the only way, at Harvard, of arranging for part-time employment. But neither the lectureship nor the research positions carry the high status of regular faculty positions; both types of appointments can interfere with professional mobility or advancement if held for a long period of time. Other universities seldom recruit faculty from among those who have held Harvard off-ladder appointments for more than a few years; Harvard departments only occasionally make tenure appointments from among their lecturers or research fellows; scholars

who remain in these irregular positions do not feel the incentives to publish and move ahead felt by those in regular faculty positions. National statistics indicate that women, both married and unmarried, are far more likely to be offered jobs in these irregular categories than are men, and our interviews suggest that, at Harvard, women are more likely to remain in off-ladder appointments. One department chairman expressed this succinctly: "The prospects for women obtaining regular staff positions are certainly not good, here or elsewhere. They are more likely to end up in research positions where academic tenure is not at issue." In our interviews, we have discovered cases of women who were unable to leave the Boston area or needed to work part-time for a certain portion of their lives who accepted off-ladder appointments for which they felt they were over-qualified. Male contemporaries with comparable records were generally offered assistant professorships. In at least three cases, the women were subsequently vetoed for tenure in these off-ladder appointments by the president of the University on the grounds that they were "over-qualified" for such positions and that the University did not wish to create a "second faculty" composed of those unable to leave the area. (One of these women subsequently won appointment.) Clearly there has been a tendency in the past to employ in irregular positions women who were unable to compete equally on the job market because of the need for part-time work or the lack of geographical mobility, but who were more highly qualified than men who were offered similar jobs. There has also been a greater willingness to hire young women as subordinates or assistants than as colleagues. Once shunted into irregular positions, which at Harvard have not carried the privilege of presidential leave or the stimulation of being considered a full member of the faculty (many Harvard departments exclude lecturers from departmental meetings), these women were often caught in a cycle of failure — to publish or teach or attract outside offers — which in turn seemed to justify their irregular positions. One woman who testified at our hearings stated the problem quite clearly:

> The thing that is most striking is that there are these two areas of activity, the regular academic ladder from assistant professorship on up, and the irregular appointments, research fellow, research associate, and lecturer. You start on the regular ladder,

possibly right after you've got your degree, and then go on up, as everyone knows. You get into the other group, one way or another, and tend to stay there. There seems to be very little mobility, at least at the higher levels. That is, maybe a research fellow will move over into the assistant professorship. A research associate tends to be already too old to be promoted to an assistant professor, so that other problems come up when the transition should be made. And the transition in general tends not to be made. So that these are sort of parallel channels that don't meet now. Personally, I like the idea of flexibility. I like the idea of multiple options, and I don't think this is too bad a system.

> What bothers me about it is that by some strange accident, most of the people on the regular ladder, if we may call it that, that is the professional ladder, are men, and most of the people on the parallel group are women. . . . So it seems to me that there's something funny in there, and one of the things that bothers me is that I bet that most of the men in my department . . . haven't thought about it, and what's worse, until a year or two ago, I hadn't . . . And it's only been recently . . . that even I have begun to think about it. I just have the feeling that the official structure is lagging a little behind me. . . .

We conclude that the lectureship and the various research positions have valuable uses for those who hold them and for the University, but we very much doubt whether, where women are concerned, these appointments have always been used in valuable or equitable ways.

The absence of women in the upper ranks of the regular faculty and the fact that women tend to cluster in irregular appointments has created among female faculty members a general feeling of isolation. Women faculty voice exactly the same sense of being intruders in a male institution that Radcliffe students express about their participation in Harvard College. Some female faculty members who are in irregular appointments express feelings of inferiority or marginality. Women in regular faculty positions are more hopeful and self-confident. Many of the female assistant professors responded in interviews that they felt their chances for promotion to be as good as those of a man, although those without children voiced the almost unanimous opinion that they would have no chance of advancement

unless they remained childless, a view we take up in our next chapter. Most of the female assistant professors also felt that they were regarded as full members of their departments, although several reported rude comments from male colleagues about women academics or embarrassing questions about their marital or child-bearing plans.

Harvard department chairmen were more explicit in discussing prejudice than were the women themselves. One commented: "I have the definite sense that artificial obstacles have been raised to the equal treatment of women at Harvard and would support reasonable legislation designed to remove them." Another wrote: "I would suspect that if there were good women candidates there would be some resistance [to hiring them], certainly to considering them for a tenured position." Discussing general resistance in his field to hiring women, the same professor continued:

> I feel an automatic barrier being raised when I talk to a department chairman about a woman for an open position. A not atypical response is 'You're not serious, are you?' I have a rather naive and simple explanation for that difficulty — prejudice. Though there are many reasons given, including attrition rate, lack of success, distractibility, and other reasons, I think most are blinds. I have no doubt that some men sincerely believe in these reasons just as I believe some men sincerely believe that women are inferior.

Graduate Students

In contrast to faculty women, who are present in tiny numbers, and undergraduate women, who are not officially recognized as Harvard students, graduate women are present in sizeable numbers and are equal members of the Harvard community. It has been many years since women graduate students were forbidden to enter the Widener stacks, and Margaret Mead's story of a female graduate student in physical anthropology who had to sit in a closet and listen to lectures through a crack in the door is now an amusing anecdote in the social history of past decades. By and large, women are admitted to the graduate school without discrimination and are awarded scholarships and teaching fellowships fairly. They have equal access to most University funds and facilities. Yet women

graduate students are frequently made to feel as if they are (or ought to be) still listening through the crack in the door. And some of those who experience little isolation or prejudice in their early years of graduate school begin to feel increasingly uneasy as the possibility of sex discrimination in the job market looms ever more likely. The statistics that we present below show a pattern of equitable treatment for women and men in the Harvard Graduate School of Arts and Sciences; the results of our questionnaire show a different pattern. Women in the graduate school, like women on the faculty, *do* encounter prejudice at Harvard.

Women in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences are present in significant numbers: 743 out of a total enrollment of 2993 in February of 1971. They represent 31% of the enrollment in the Humanities, 22% in the Social Sciences, and 16% in the Natural Sciences. The situation of these women graduate students has improved markedly in many ways in the past ten years — a fact that is connected, we are convinced, with the merger of the Radcliffe Graduate School and the Harvard Graduate School of Arts and Sciences in 1962–63 (see Table III). A comparison of figures for 1959–60, a pre-merger year, when women attended the GSAS under the auspices of Radcliffe, with figures for 1968–69 shows that the number of men enrolled increased from 1749 to 2237, whereas the number of women jumped from 394 to 653, thus resulting in a significant increase in the percentage of women enrolled. In the same nine year period, the percentage of women holding teaching fellowships increased by 15.1% whereas the percentage of men increased by only 12.3%. Similarly, the number of female students receiving the Ph.D. increased from 32 in 1959–60 to 87 in 1968–69 whereas the number of male students increased from 303 to 372. Thus the male recipients of the Ph.D. actually decreased slightly in proportion to the greater enrollment of male students, whereas the percentage of female degree recipients nearly doubled. These figures suggest that the male attrition rate is rising slightly while the female attrition rate declines, a fact which we discuss in more detail below.

The statistical information that we have collected suggests that, in the last years of the 1960's, women applicants and students have been treated equitably by the admissions and scholarship committees of Harvard departments. In the graduate school

as a whole, the percentage of applicants accepted is similar for men and women. In 1968–69, 29.7% of male applicants were accepted and 26.7% of female applicants. In 1967–68, 26.6% of male applicants were accepted and 26.9% of female applicants. A study of admissions data for individual departments for the years 1967–69 (see Table IV) indicates that most departments accept roughly equal percentages of male and female applicants. Our committee has been told about two departments which in the past had quotas for female students; one of these departments still receives a high percentage of female applicants and admits a noticeably smaller percentage of the women who apply. We have moreover received isolated complaints of discrimination in admissions; one department chairman, replying to our letter, referred to a "subtle reaction against certain women applicants, particularly those who may not be at the very top of the list in quality." It is thus possible that some departments in which the female applicant pool is of exceptionally high quality discriminate slightly in admissions, but we are impressed by the apparently equitable treatment of male and female applicants by departmental admissions committees.

In general, graduate women are also treated fairly in the awarding of scholarships (see Table V). A study of scholarship grants to incoming students for the period 1967–69 shows that 12% of those in the Natural Sciences who applied for scholarships were women and 12% of those who received firm offers (for all scholarships) were women; 32% of those who applied in the Humanities were women and 32% of those who received firm offers (all scholarships) were women. The picture for the Social Sciences is less satisfactory, although the responsibility seems to lie not with Harvard departments but with the policies of governmental agencies and national foundations. Whereas 22% of those applying for scholarships in the Social Sciences were women, women received only 17% of the firm offers made (all scholarships).

A study of the distribution of Harvard unrestricted funds for 1970–71 indicates that only 20.1% of the first year graduate students who receive Harvard scholarships are women, whereas 29.8% of those in their second year and beyond who receive Harvard scholarships are women. The same study reveals that the average size of award to a female student in her second year or beyond is $1789 whereas the average award to male students

in the same category is $1974. These facts are hard to interpret. The smaller size of the grants to graduate women beyond the first year is partly explained by the fact that a higher percentage of scholarship applicants in the Humanities are women, and average grants in the Humanities are smaller than in the Natural Sciences and Social Sciences. The smaller percentage of first year women receiving support from Harvard is partly explained by the fact that many women enroll in masters programs, where scholarship funds are more difficult to obtain. It is partly explained also by a difference in the percentage of women applying for scholarships in the first year class and in subsequent classes. But the Dean of the Graduate School has suggested to our committee that the smaller percentage of first year women receiving Harvard funds possibly also reflects a suspicion on the part of some departments about the commitment of incoming female students, an assumption that female students should "prove themselves" before receiving scholarship aid. In any case, the large increase in the percentage of female scholarship recipients after the first year of graduate school is a tribute to the academic performance of graduate women.

Statistical data on the distribution of teaching fellowships reveals a picture unmarred by even the slight inequities found on the scholarship scene (see Tables VI and VII). In the period between 1967 and 1970, we have discovered no inequities in the distribution of teaching fellowships in any of the three major divisions of the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences, no inequities in the number of fifths of teaching fellowship time available to men and women, and no tendency to employ women in General Education rather than in their own departments. In admissions, in scholarship aid, and in the very important support and professional training provided by teaching fellowships, female graduate students are treated justly by Harvard departments.

The results of a questionnaire distributed by our committee in the fall of 1970 suggest that the female students who study and teach in the GSAS are highly motivated, diligent, career-oriented young women. Nothing could be further from the truth than the unflattering stereotype of the woman graduate student as uncertain in her commitment to scholarship, malingering on her way to the degree, in constant danger of dropping out entirely. National Academy of Science statistics indicate

that women who received degrees in the United States in the years between 1965 and 1967 worked no longer for the degree than men did in the physical and biological sciences, slightly longer in the Social Sciences, and almost two years longer in the Humanities (see Table VIII). At Harvard, however, women took less time to the degree in the physical sciences (6.0 as opposed to 6.4 years for men), exactly the same amount of time to the degree in the biological sciences (6.4) and social sciences (8.1), and only very slightly longer in the Humanities (8.2 as opposed to 8.0 years for men). The common belief that female graduate students at Harvard take longer to complete their degree work — a belief which was corroborated by fact in the 1950's (see Table VIII and Appendix 2B) — should now be discarded.

The question of the attrition rate for female doctoral candidates is more complicated. Without studying the problem, the *Report of the Committee on the Future of the Graduate School* (March, 1969) repeated the conventional wisdom that "the drop-out rate is markedly greater for female students than for males." And a study conducted by President Bunting of women who entered the graduate school in 1954–64 in three selected departments (English, Fine Arts and Biology) indicated that this was indeed the case in the 1950's. But Dr. Humphrey Doermann's study "Baccalaureate Origins and the Performance of Students in the Harvard Graduate School of Arts and Sciences" suggests that in the second half of the 1960's female attrition is significantly higher than male attrition only in the Humanities. Admitting that attrition is almost impossible to calculate, Dr. Doermann takes as a rough index the ratio of enrolled graduate students to Ph.D.'s awarded (see Table IX). The ratio of women students enrolled to women Ph.D.'s is higher in all three areas of the graduate school (but not all departments), with relatively little difference in the Natural Sciences (6.7 male students enrolled per Ph.D. awarded, 7.2 female students enrolled per Ph.D. awarded), somewhat more difference in the Social Sciences (6.2 to 8.9) and considerable difference in the Humanities (6.9 to 13.8). But, Dr. Doermann comments:

> . . . several departments, particularly in the Humanities, admit students for the M.A. degree and then select the most promising

> of those for doctoral study; but an unknown number of these A.M. admissions were 'terminal' A.M. admissions, either explicitly stated or at least anticipated. Since the enrollees for 'terminal' A.M. study have not been deleted from the ratios [in Table IX] and since these in some departments may include a disproportionate number of women, the doctoral dropout for women in these departments implied by their high ratios may be overstated.

Our data on admissions indicates that women are present in large numbers in at least two programs that offer many terminal M.A. degrees, Romance Languages and the Soviet Union regional studies program (which offers only the A.M. to all students). And a brief study of the enrollment in Romance Languages, a department with a high ratio of women enrolled to Ph.D.'s awarded (6.1 to 11.3), suggests that this department, in which women are a high percentage of those enrolled (64%) has in the past included an even higher percentage of women among those receiving 'terminal' M.A.'s. National statistics indicate that women have a higher rate of transfer to other graduate schools than men, and some decrease in female enrollment between the first and second years of graduate school (and possibly between the second and third years) may also be explained by this identifiable national pattern.

The assumption that women drop out of graduate study in markedly larger numbers than men was, we think, disproved by the Doermann Report. We hope that it will now at last begin to disappear from among current clichés. It is clear that, at Harvard, the attrition rate for women is significantly greater than for men only in the Humanities and that the importance of even this statistic should be questioned. The two cautionary notes added by the Women's Faculty Group in their report of March 1970 should also be considered:

> The significance for the academic profession of female attrition may be different from the significance of male attrition. A male who 'drops-out' presumably moves to another profession; a female who 'drops-out' may be more likely to return at a later date either to graduate school (not necessarily Harvard) or to a job, such as secondary school or junior college teaching, that uses her original training. . . . As long as highly trained women experience difficulty in gaining employment commensurate with

their skills, women will face pressures for dropping-out greater than those faced by men. Consequently, statistical evidence on attrition will be a dangerous basis for any arguments about the relative motivation of men and women.

Finally, the somewhat higher female attrition that presently exists is steadily being reduced, while the attrition rate for men appears to be rising slightly. The Doermann report noted that "the number of Ph.D.'s awarded to women has shown a higher percentage increase in each of the three major areas than for men between 1955-and-1956 and 1965-and-66." Our comparison of figures from 1959–60 and 1968–69 reveals that the trend has continued. As we noted above, the percentage of female degree recipients compared to the number of women enrolled approximately doubled in the nine year period, while the percentage of male degree recipients actually decreased slightly in proportion to male enrollment.

Statistical data thus indicates that the percentage of women among those studying for Ph.D.'s at Harvard is increasing, that these women proceed as promptly to completion of degree requirements as men, and that, although they are somewhat more likely to drop out than men, they are increasingly *less* likely to drop out whereas men are increasingly more likely. Data from our questionnaire reinforces this picture of graduate women as serious and career-oriented students (see Appendix 2A). To the question, "If you had completely free choice, would you choose a career at all?" 21% of the male respondents answered "No," but only 8% of the female respondents. 37% of the female respondents and 52% of the male respondents wanted "very much" to "work full-time for your entire career," but 30% of the women and 64% of the men expected to work full-time. It is clear that, whereas women expect child-rearing to hinder the possibility of full-time work even when they strongly desire such work, men fear that career pressure will require full-time work, even when they do not desire it. Similarly, only 14% of female respondents hope to take a break in their careers, whereas 22% of male respondents hope to do so; 23% of female respondents, however, expect some break in their careers, whereas only 17% of male respondents expect this. It is perhaps natural that members of each sex desire more freedom to pursue the possibilities which society sees as the

prerogative of the opposite sex. What is important for our purposes is that the slight increase in male attrition and the marked decrease in female attrition perhaps suggest that men and women are beginning to act on the basis of these desires. The fact that slightly more than half of female respondents and slightly less than half of male respondents wanted to make career arrangements for themselves and their spouses which might involve compromise for both spouses and 43% of females and 40% of males *expected* to make such arrangements, whereas only 32% of female respondents expected to follow their husbands wherever job opportunities led, suggests again that career patterns may be changing for young academics of both sexes.

Yet, despite the record of Harvard departments in admitting, educating and supporting female students, graduate women are subjected to pressures and injustices not experienced by male students. These injustices include some vestiges of institutional discrimination — most clearly in the present housing arrangements for graduate women. Dormitory space for women is restricted to three buildings: Wyeth Hall (51 places for women, 22 places for men), the Radcliffe Graduate Center (102 places for women, 35 places for men) and Harkness Commons (Child Hall has two floors for women, almost three floors for men; other Harkness housing is for men). Room rent at the Radcliffe Graduate Center and Wyeth Hall is $620 for rooms similar to those costing $440 at Harkness Commons; in addition, the Radcliffe Center has until very recently required compulsory partial board of $380, whereas Harkness does not require a board contract. The majority of single women who use University housing are therefore required to pay higher rents for equal accommodations, although this situation is at present under review. Athletic facilities for women have, moreover, become increasingly restricted over the past few years, because the Radcliffe Gymnasium has limited opportunities for graduate women. But recent efforts of the Commission on Inquiry have begun to improve the situation by making Harvard facilities more available.

Both the annoyance of poor athletic facilities and the grave problem of expensive housing can be traced to the residual connection of women graduate students to Radcliffe, which continued to provide these facilities after the merger of the graduate schools. Financial difficulties at Radcliffe narrowed the range

021

of accommodations for women, and Harvard has, as yet, moved very little to fill the gap.

After the merger of the Graduate Schools, most prizes and post-doctoral fellowships were opened to women. But the Junior Fellowships were, this past fall, still restricted to men, although we understand that this restriction will be removed next fall and we applaud that decision. In the past year, owing largely to the initiation of co-residential housing, Harvard Houses have made serious efforts to include women in the Senior Common Rooms: 15% of resident tutors are now women, and 16% of non-resident tutors (see Table X). But women are still under-represented in these positions, and two of the residential houses still have no female resident tutor. In none of the Harvard Houses is the Senior Tutor a woman. At present there are no female counsellors at the Bureau of Study Counsel, although the Bureau expects to have one woman counsellor next fall. Thus, although women are equitably represented among holders of teaching fellowships, they do not yet have equal access to other positions for which graduate students are normally hired.

Probably as a holdover from the days when Harvard and Radcliffe were separate institutions, the printed material at Harvard is still addressed to men. Every graduate woman is bombarded with forms that read "Dear Sir," "Mr. ————," "name of wife," and "your wife is also invited." In these trivial ways, Harvard encourages women students to view themselves as "exceptions" or "outsiders." Over two-thirds of the respondents to our questionnaire described Harvard as "a school primarily for men to which women are admitted," and such small official discourtesies contribute to this impression.

The results of our questionnaire clearly indicate that, despite the high motivation of female graduate students, these students experience and anticipate greater difficulties in their careers than do male students (see Appendix 2A). Fewer of the female respondents than of the male respondents felt that their advisers would recommend them for assistant professorships in major universities; fewer of the women than of the men felt that they would be recommended for such positions in good liberal arts colleges. Although the level of expectation for both groups is high (perhaps unrealistically high), the difference between male and female expectations is significant. Even more significant is the fact that 26% of female respondents (as opposed to 11%

of male respondents) answered that faculty members "had told them or given them the impression that they were not serious students." Moreover, 37% of the female respondents had been told or had received the impression that their sex was a drawback in their chosen careers. Graduate student women we have consulted point out that such attitudes are particularly infuriating and depressing. We agree. Sex, like race and color, cannot be changed. It is discourteous and cruel to imply that it ought to be.

Both men and women have noticed prejudice at Harvard. Significant numbers of those who responded to our questionnaire had been told or given the impression that women are not serious scholars, that women do not have minds suitable for certain academic fields, that there are few or no career possibilities for women in certain fields, and that faculty members prefer all-male departments. Interestingly enough, from 10% to 23% of the men replying have noticed an atmosphere unfavorable to women as scholars, intellectuals, and colleagues. Moreover, in a sampling of 250 answers to an open-ended question about forms of discrimination encountered in the University, 56% of the women and 10% of the men specifically mentioned examples of prejudice against women; 36% of all respondents to a question about general ambiance replied that they had heard of members of their department who had a negative attitude toward women students.

This statistical picture is complemented by the remarks of graduate women on their questionnaires and in the open hearings. Women students have informed us repeatedly that they are irritated at being judged on the basis of other women's past performance, that they dislike being told about the failure of other women students, as though this reflects on their own potential for success in their departments. As one woman put it:

> The chief problem is an atmosphere in which one is assumed to be not seriously committed to the field until proven innocent. In a graduate school where the pressures on male students are already considerable, women . . . must outshine their male contemporaries, at least in endurance and seriousness, simply to survive.

Constantly under pressure to prove their commitment as well as their excellence, women graduate students find themselves

sometimes condemned for conforming to a female stereotype and sometimes condemned for failing to conform. The student who has been told " 'From your writing, one could almost forget you are a woman' — meant as a compliment!" or "If you don't stop being so aggressive, no one will want to marry you," or ". . . not a few of us are suckers for a pretty face," feels quite naturally that she is not taken seriously as a scholar. The discouraging effect of such remarks can to a certain extent be alleviated by good will and tact on the part of male faculty members; but female graduate students clearly feel that the hiring of more faculty women is the only permanent solution. We are inclined to agree. A situation in which professors are all males, whereas many students are females, tends to reduce the drive, the ambition, and the hopes of graduate women. At one of our open hearings, President Bunting urged the hiring of more women faculty members, saying that she felt it was even more important as a means of changing faculty attitudes towards students, than as a means of changing the attitudes of students themselves.

> I think a great many men on the faculty haven't had the experience of working with able women on a professionally equal level for a great many years . . . and that slowly this has some very unfortunate effects. For most students . . . it doesn't make any difference if the professor is a man or a woman; but if the professor's attitude toward the student is slightly patronizing and slightly flirtatious, then there is a deadening effect that is not at all good . . .

53% of the women (and 24% of the men) who answered our questionnaire felt that it would be "extremely helpful" to have more women on the faculty; indeed the only suggestion in a long list which met with more enthusiasm was a birth control clinic at the University Health Services. 70% of the female respondents (compared to 39% of the male respondents) said that the attitude of faculty women toward women students "is "helpful and encouraging." It is highly unlikely, given the tiny number of women on the faculty, that 70% of the female students could have had contact with them. These answers seem rather to reflect a deep desire on the part of women graduate students for the kind of encouragement they expect to find from women faculty.

The major problem faced by female graduate students is not, however, the vaguely hostile or vaguely condescending attitudes they frequently encounter, although we deplore the fact that they so frequently encounter them. The major problem is job placement. It is a difficult problem to document. Few departments keep systematic records on the successes and failures of their graduates on the job market. But the results of our questionnaire to graduate alumni and alumnae suggest that women have greater difficulty in job placement (see Appendix 2B). And the national evidence is clear, as is the evidence of Harvard's own hiring pattern: women receive the Ph.D. in increasing numbers, and then disappear — not from the academic world but from high-status institutions. One department chairman commented to our committee:

> The first-rate woman graduate student has no more difficulty — and perhaps less — in getting a job than the first-rate male student. The average woman student has more difficulty than the average male, and the poor woman student has much greater difficulty than the poor male student.

A female graduate student described the problem from her point of view:

> I hope that everyone will be a superior scholar, but you see the question is not with the top five percent of either sex, but with the fine, though not distinguished, majority who people the ranks of even the Harvard Graduate School. The question is, 'Do these women get treated as well as the men?' and the answer is undeniably 'No.'

Another female student wrote:

> In my field, it seems that a kind of covert discrimination begins with job recommendations. The problem does not arise during course work . . . but later, when the women have the training and their professors (and some of the women themselves) begin to doubt that they can do much with it.

Women students are not unperceptive when they reply to our questionnaire that they anticipate greater difficulties than male students in finding jobs commensurate with their abilities and

training. Moreover, women students expect little help from faculty members in solving problems of sex discrimination; and, thus far, they appear to have been correct in their expectation. Whereas 118 women replied that faculty members had discussed with them the possibility of sex discrimination, only 39 women replied that any faculty member had ever offered to help counter that discrimination. Warnings that discrimination may lie ahead tend to frighten and discourage women students unless the warnings are accompanied by indignation at such discrimination and a willingness to combat it.

The problem for faculty women and for women graduate students is thus in some sense the same problem. It is a simple and obvious problem: women are not hired in significant numbers by high-status institutions. There are virtually no women on the Harvard faculty; female graduate students anticipate and encounter difficulties in job placement. The solution is equally simple: more women must be hired, here and elsewhere. In order for this to happen, existing prejudice against women as scholars and colleagues must cease to stand in the way of hiring, and new career patterns must be permitted for women who desire to combine careers and families. The first change requires simply a commitment to change, but the second is in some ways unfamiliar, and even disturbing, to us all. It is to this second change, the recognition of new career patterns, that we turn in Chapter II.

II

CAREER PATTERNS AND ACADEMIC COMMITMENT

Of women holding regular positions on the Harvard faculty, the largest number are childless or unmarried. At the same time, a considerable number of women in the graduate school are married (43% of those responding to our questionnaire, the same figure as for men) and either have children or intend to have them in the near future. National statistics, cited in our first chapter, suggest that "singleness" is the usual condition of academic women. It is presumably the condition preferred by academic men. Many departmental chairmen here at Harvard say that this is so, even when they express no such preference of their own; and women are emphatic in believing this to be the case. Most of the faculty women we spoke to felt that they would not have the jobs they hold today were they married — even if every other factor on their *vitae* were unchanged. Nearly two-thirds of graduate students believe "that Harvard professors think that women must make a choice between an academic career and marriage and/or a family."

It was once commonly accepted that women who sought academic careers would give up marriage and child-bearing. In the 1920's, when women made up a higher proportion of college and university faculties than they do at present, the overwhelming majority of them were single. Increasingly, women are unwilling to make that choice, or unwilling to allow men to demand it of them. Their refusal seems to us entirely justified, and the proposals we make in subsequent chapters are designed in part to accommodate it. Married women with children will still face (whatever proposals are adopted) many difficulties along the way to becoming professional scholars and teachers, but the choice between conventional career and conventional home is, we are convinced, a great deal more stark and brutal

than it needs to be. As long as such a choice is required, academic women will be, and will be regarded as, "exceptional" — a tag that few of us, male or female, can carry for long, and that inevitably means discouragement and frustration for married women, and even for single women, attempting to pursue careers.

Our interviews and hearings suggest strongly that graduate student couples are increasingly sharing responsibility for the raising of their children. Conceivably, in the next decade, male academics will begin to feel the same need for more flexible schedules and for new definitions of "regular" student and faculty status that is now felt by women attempting to combine scholarly careers and family roles. But in the America of 1971, family and children are seen as the special responsibility and special problem of women. Significant numbers of women, then, are likely to need and seek out work arrangements and career patterns different from those conventionally chosen by men.

Many women, of course, will choose careers exactly like those of their male counterparts — full time all the way — and they should certainly be encouraged to do so. (Approximately 1/3 of the female graduate students responding to our questionnaire indicated that they intended to have careers of this sort.) Two other possible patterns must, however, be considered by the Faculty if it is to make decisions genuinely helpful to academic women. The first of these involves postponing or interrupting teaching and research so that a woman can, for a number of years, devote all or most of her time to the raising of her children. The second involves part-time graduate study or teaching and research during the child-raising years. The first undoubtedly has its attractions, although we shall argue that it is not the pattern that the university ought chiefly to encourage. Having children and a career sequentially rather than simultaneously clearly does reduce the strains that professional women, given present social arrangements, must inevitably endure. We all live longer, are healthier longer, and it is not impossible to begin a career at thirty or thirty-five. But the years before, however satisfying they may be in human terms, are often difficult and lonely intellectually. We sometimes speak skeptically of the "community of scholars," but there is help, support, criticism, and rivalry inside that community which

many male and female scholars could not do without. Sometimes, no doubt, married women find such help and support (and rivalry) in their own families and among their friends. And sometimes, the work of raising children is connected with and relevant to the academic discipline whose study they hope to resume. Nevertheless, the resumption is often painful. In academic accomplishment, the returning women are obviously behind men of the same age; and they may have fallen behind in more serious ways too: they have often lost the self-confidence and assertiveness which led them to plan a professional career in the first place. Here, however, a great deal depends on the ways they are received by the universities they re-enter.

We shall suggest below some modest ways in which the university might be made more open than it presently is to older men and women who have begun their academic work after years spent at other activities, public or private. It is not necessary, nor to our minds especially desirable, that all graduate students or all assistant professors be exactly the same age. Graduate studies have often been begun ten or fifteen years after the completion of undergraduate work; many excellent faculty members at this and other universities have been appointed relatively late in life after a change of career. There are all sorts of problems inherent in these latter-day beginnings and resumptions, and many of them simply have to be worked out by the individuals involved. But the university can help. Research centers and institutes (the Radcliffe Institute, for example) can be crucial in easing the way back into the routines of academic life, providing time for older men and women to write, plan courses, and prove themselves to their colleagues. Fellowships at a center are really helpful, however, only if they point the way to professorships at a university. It is important to stress that the men and women who hold marginal or temporary positions are possible faculty members, here or elsewhere, not simply interesting people to have around. They should be considered for regular jobs, and when they are considered, they should be judged entirely on the basis of their scholarly achievement and potential. Neither their age, nor, in the case of women, their family situation, should be factors in evaluating their intellectual promise. That they have done other things and delayed their academic careers should not be regarded as a necessary and obvious defect, but as a possible

enrichment of the skills and interests they bring to the university.

For most women, however, as for most men, we believe that continuous contact with the academic community is a great deal more satisfactory than these latter-day beginnings and resumptions, a great deal more likely to lead to a satisfying and fruitful career. But continual contact is only possible if arrangements are worked out which would allow those women who must do so to remain at home for some portion of the day, while still enjoying regular student or faculty status. These arrangements will obviously involve part-time study and teaching: they are the substance of some of the most important recommendations we make in the next two chapters.

At present, the only part-time appointment permitted at Harvard is the lectureship, by definition an "irregular" appointment, while part-time graduate study, possible under the rules and regulations of the University, is in fact very difficult to work out in many departments. Part-time status for women and for men who need it is available only rarely and carries with it connotations of marginality and even of failure. We shall recommend below that both part-time study and part-time teaching become fully acceptable career patterns at the University, that there be part-time assistant, associate and full professors as well as part-time lecturers, that there be part-time graduate students with regular fellowship support rather than a few part-time female students supported by special funds and considered to have special problems.

It is curious that Harvard should have frowned upon such part-time arrangements in the past, for we have no very clear notion of what constitutes full-time work, although we utilize certain arbitrary definitions (e.g. a four course load for graduate students). Harvard has never required effort-reporting from either its teachers or its students. Neither university teaching and research nor graduate study have ever been defined as requiring a 40 or a 60 or an 80-hour week. Appointments to faculty positions and admission to graduate school are made on the basis of excellence — a standard that does not measure the time spent preparing the book or experiment or course, a standard that does not take into account wide variations in the proportion of a person's time spent on teaching or research. Moreover, neither the economist who commutes to Washington, the chemist who spends half his time administering an

undergraduate house, nor the medieval historian who serves on the Faculty Council is working "full-time" on teaching or research, unless these activities are conceived to be so broad as to be almost synonymous with living. We shall have more to say about this later on, but we do not believe that the apprehensions which we know to exist about part-time work have much to do with the problem of time. "Full" and "part-time" are words used to speak, not of hours spent, but of commitment. Many of our colleagues fear that women and men who receive only a partial salary from the University and who carry a reduced load of teaching or study will be less committed to the institution and, more importantly, less committed to intellectual excellence.

Behind our present arrangements for work and study, then, lies the assumption that intellectual seriousness is bound up in some special way with the conventional career pattern. We wish to challenge this assumption and to suggest that graduate school admission and faculty status be granted simply on the basis of academic accomplishment and without reference to any precise time commitment. Once admitted or once hired, individual men and women should (within limits which we will specify below) have the freedom to work out a full or part-time schedule according to their particular needs, and should be paid or supported, of course, in proportion to the work load they choose to carry. But before outlining the arrangements that will make this possible, we should consider the not unreasonable fears that underlie what might be called "the theory of full-time."

One source of apprehension about part-time status appears to be a general and virtually automatic mental association between the commitment to scholarship and the ambition for academic place, such that the existence of the latter is often taken as the only sure guarantee of the existence of the former. We are not certain a man is a scholar if he displays no interest in becoming a professor. The association is natural enough, though it cannot be very old; amateur scholarship these days is rarely of high quality. And we are suspicious too of semi-professionals. Hence the onus borne by persons pursuing what has been called "a career of limited ambition" or even pursuing a conventional career at some private or idiosyncratic pace by working part-time. There is no intrinsic reason to doubt the

scholarly zeal of such persons, no reason at all, perhaps, when we see the obstacles they must overcome. It is certainly true that they have in the past been less productive (even relative to the time they spend) than full-time academics, but that may be because the commitment of the full-timers is reinforced by their academic status. Surely the best way to insure that those who work part-time or at an idiosyncratic pace do actually produce in proportion to the time they invest is to give full recognition and encouragement to the work that they do produce and to facilitate and *expect* the transition from part-time to full-time when other aspects of a person's life allow this.

In addition to general uneasiness about the level of achievement in "careers of limited ambition," many in the University community seem to feel doubts about the more specific contributions to teaching, learning and administration made by part-time teachers and students. A number of department chairmen, responding to our inquiries, have written of "bad experiences" with men and women working or studying less than full-time. Part-time academics have sometimes not felt much loyalty to the University as an institution or to their own departments. Some part-time teachers have neglected to share in administrative chores, or have tended to give their lectures and disappear, maintaining only casual contact with their students. Part-time students have required the attention and time of their teachers, and then, too often, have faltered in their work or dropped out entirely. These "bad experiences" might, of course, be looked at from the other side. Condemned in advance to marginality, part-time students and teachers have been largely without the support of academic collegiality, ignored by colleagues, neglected by teachers, left largely to their own devices. It is not unnatural that marginal people sometimes falter, questioning whether it is "worth it" to continue. Indeed, given the problems created by marginal status, we were surprised to find, in our interviews, that many part-time teachers in the University carry almost full-time work loads and shoulder heavy administrative and advising burdens. In short, some part-time teachers are part-time in the number of course hours they teach and the recognition they receive, but full-time in sharing the burden of departmental business. If the negative implications associated with part-time status were removed, we would expect to find the number of "bad experiences" radically decreased.

Behind the "theory of full-time" also lies an economic argument. The accommodation of part-time students and teachers is sometimes said to be incompatible with the efficient use of University resources — as if the value of our "products" were to be measured by the cheapness of our "production costs." If this were the case, then efficiency would be maximized by choosing those candidates for graduate study and junior teaching posts least likely to tolerate or seek out interruptions, most likely to move along at a rapid pace. But intellectual criteria dictate other choices. And the current "glut" on the Ph.D. job market would suggest that speed in completing degree requirements is no longer *in itself* an advantage. The presence of people who do not move along at a rapid pace does, of course, impose costs on the University (and in certain laboratory programs these costs may be serious), but it is not clear to us what follows from this fact. These may simply be the costs involved in educating certain sorts of intelligent and deserving people.

The necessity of full-time commitment is sometimes said to apply particularly stringently in certain sorts of scientific research, which are described as requiring "full-time" not in the sense of any particular number of hours but in the sense of something like permanent availability. It may well be the case that such research is open only to women and men who have no family ties or no very close and restrictive family ties. But this is an argument that applies only to very limited areas of University life.

We cannot draw from any of these arguments or assumptions the usual conclusion that part-time work is to be avoided whenever possible. They seem open, in fact, to a very different conclusion, pressed on us also by considerations of equity: that is, that some sort of part-time work for men and women be permitted as an *ordinary* feature of University life. Many of the negative features of such work would be overcome, we believe, if the University contrived ways of providing encouragement and support for men and women studying or teaching part-time. We will suggest a number of such arrangements later on. Our suggestions will be modest, for we do recognize the value, both to the University and to the individual student and scholar, of the conventional career pattern and of the long working day. Indeed, one of the things we hope to do is to open such careers to people who cannot begin by working full-time or who do

begin knowing that they will be interrupted. So long as a University education is open to such people, as it should be, the later waste of their talents and energies ought to be a matter of grave concern to the Faculty.

III

WOMEN ON THE FACULTY

The first chapter of our report presents a depressing picture of the present employment of women in tenured and non-tenured positions in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. In terms of percentages, either relative to the number of women graduates or absolutely, the figures are disgracefully small. We have argued in Chapter I that national statistics do not indicate an exodus of women from academic careers of such catastrophic proportions as would be necessary to explain the Harvard situation. They indicate instead that women are less likely than men to gain employment at major universities, more likely than men to teach in junior colleges, teacher's colleges, women's colleges or small liberal arts colleges — facts for which the Harvard situation could be one of the causes as easily as one of the results. We have discussed in Chapter II the difficulties faced by women who attempt to combine family and career. But we do not believe that these difficulties entirely explain the absence of women on the Harvard faculty. We are not arguing, on the other hand, that the depressing figures are due entirely to overt discrimination, although we have found evidence of discrimination just as we have found evidence of career difficulties. To a considerable extent, the present situation must be explained by Harvard's history. A male bastion for more than three centuries, growing over time from a denominational men's college to a major university, Harvard has been slow to recognize changes in ideas about sex roles. It has tended to overlook injustices and has continued to "do business in the usual manner." But we have now reached that point which usually precedes significant change: when the injustice is so visible and the discontent so apparent that few can doubt the need for reform.

Reform must come:

1. as a matter of simple justice. Women who have committed a substantial part of their lives to preparing themselves for future

careers must have a fair chance at the careers they seek. They deserve equal treatment for equal ability. The "career open to talents" is one of the original aspirations of liberal society; it should be our aspiration still.

2. as a matter of self-interest. The enormous waste of resources involved in training large numbers of women only a small fraction of whom can find satisfactory employment is a luxury we cannot afford. Not all graduate students, to be sure, are trained to be academics; but a substantial proportion of graduate students who complete their degree programs (from 25% in some departments to 90% in others) enter the academic world. We are not investigating the problems of those women graduates who plan to work outside the university (except indirectly in our discussion of job placement). No doubt there is much waste of training and talent there too, but, in focusing on the Harvard situation, we must be concerned first with the loss to this and other universities.

3. for the sake of our own students. Harvard ought to demonstrate that it is ready to offer positions to talented women so as to encourage our own talented women, in Radcliffe and in the graduate school, to pursue careers in teaching and research. The presence of a significant number of women professors on the Harvard faculty is the only way to convince students that university research and advanced teaching are not male preserves. It is also valuable for female students to have female tutors, advisors, and professors to turn to for advice, and valuable again for male students to see that women are capable of the highest academic work.

4. for the sake of the faculty. The presence of women on the faculty may help to eliminate, or at least to change, some of the stereotypes that academics, like members of other social groups, carry around in their heads. A more open approach to learning and research might well result.

5. for the sake of women themselves. Self-doubt and the sense of inadequacy, what our colleague Matina Horner calls "the motive to avoid success" — all these seemingly built into women by our culture — are powerful barriers both to academic achievement and to personal satisfaction in teaching and research. The sources of these feelings are deep and complex. In many cases, they act as self-fulfilling prophecies. A successful person must have more than ability; he or she must feel and act

like a successful person. A secret sense of failing usually eventuates in actual failure. It is obviously true that having more women professors at Harvard will not solve this deep-rooted psychological problem. It will, however, help to strengthen and generate self-confidence in women. As an institution devoted to educating both men and women, to encouraging their creativity and accomplishment, Harvard should regard this as an important educational goal.

At this point it might be helpful to consider an argument that we have heard so often, from both men and women, that we must take it seriously. Radcliffe students, testifying at our hearings, suggested that their female teachers were unusually good teachers; some faculty members, both male and female, have suggested that "women are better teachers than men;" one female graduate student, in a long and serious letter to our committee, argued that the number of women at Harvard could not be increased until Harvard placed more value on the teaching role. These arguments can easily become the basis for a proposal that women ought be hired for their teaching ability whereas men are (and presumably ought to be) hired for their brilliance in scholarly research. That is a proposal we reject. Scholars and teachers should be hired for their brilliance *and* their teaching ability; we suggest that neither sex has a monopoly on either gift (although we are inclined to agree with the implication that some Harvard departments have paid too little attention to teaching ability in recent years). A related argument suggests that women have "maternal" or "nurturant" qualities which should be more highly valued than they presently are, while men have an aggressive energy that is already valued quite enough. We do not wish to get involved in a discussion of female and male psychology, though we should say that some of these views seem to represent a kind of stereotyping that our own experience and our committee's investigations do not support. In any case, it is clear that Harvard departments have in the past found almost *any* set of personality characteristics acceptable when they are discovered in men in combination with intelligence, creativity and devotion to education; certainly the same should be true for women. In so far as it is true that men and women differ in personality traits, we would suggest that there are paternal as well as maternal aspects of good teaching,

and that aggressiveness has no necessary connection with intelligence and perseverance, and indeed may be at least as harmful in the academic community as it is stimulating. We thus reject the argument that women should be recruited for the faculty because of their female personality traits, or that faculty standards should be changed *in order to* hire more women. But we do certainly accept the argument that Harvard will be a healthier place when there are more women here.

Considerations of equity, of self-interest, and of respect for our female students thus compel the conclusion that the number of women on the faculty must be increased. Indeed we are in the rather awkward position of finding that our diagnosis of the situation and our most fundamental recommendation are almost absurdly simple; both have been painfully obvious in this community for a long time. There are almost no women here in positions of prestige and responsibility; in the final analysis, this situation can be changed, not by committee reports describing it, but only by *hiring more women.*

The substantive recommendations in the pages that follow are designed to provide a structure for women who are not yet here. It is absolutely necessary that we do this, but the existence of the structure will not guarantee that the number of women will increase. The number of women will increase only when Harvard departments hire more women. The very creation of our committee is due not to any general recognition of the present situation but to the request of the few women presently on the faculty. We hope that, in the future, changes in the structures we propose will come in response to the needs of women, who, here in increasing numbers, will know what is necessary in order for the increase to continue still further. If more women are hired, many of the long-term changes we hope to effect will come quite naturally and many of our specific proposals can be evaluated or amended by those most directly affected.

Guidelines and The Permanent Committee on Women

We propose first, as a rough guideline, that the Harvard Faculty of Arts and Sciences strive to achieve a percentage of women in its tenured ranks equal to the percentage of women

receiving Ph.D.'s from Harvard ten years ago (9.6% in 1959–60) and a percentage of women in the non-tenured ranks equal to the percentage of women receiving Ph.D.'s from Harvard today (19% in 1968–69). We take these figures for convenience, because they are easily obtained each year, not because we feel that only Harvard graduates are candidates for the Harvard faculty. Since the admissions policy of the graduate departments in no sense favors women, and since virtually all department chairmen have assured us that women do fully as well as men in graduate study, the percentage of women receiving Ph.D.'s seems a good indication of what our commitment to the employment of women ought to be. It is, moreover, a guideline with progress built in; as the percentage increases, the number of women on the faculty should also increase, if the guidelines are followed. We are not, however, proposing a quota system; we regard it as perfectly compatible with our guidelines that in every particular case excellence and not sex (or race or age) should be the only criterion for academic employment. Nor do we expect even the immediate targets, fixed by the present percentages, to be reached in a year or two. Given the relatively small number of people hired each year at the senior level, progress will necessarily be more gradual, but it should be steady and consistent over time, approaching nearer and nearer to the guidelines even as the percentages they set increase. At the junior level, it ought to be possible to reach the present guideline in about five years.

This recommendation should not be taken to imply that departments with large female enrollments and large percentages of female Ph.D. recipients need strive only to meet the University-wide guidelines. Unless such departments make a serious effort to hire women in proportion to the numbers they educate, the number of women on the faculty will not increase rapidly or significantly. Much here depends on the Dean's efforts to encourage departmental hiring and on the firmness with which the Permanent Committee on Women requires reports of progress.

We propose secondly the creation of a Permanent Committee on Women. This Committee, consisting of five members of the Harvard Faculty of Arts and Sciences, of whom three shall be tenured and two non-tenured, shall be appointed by the Dean. We suggest that a committee of graduate students and under-

graduates be selected by the Permanent Committee to consult with it. The Permanent Committee on Women shall be charged with two tasks: periodically surveying the status of women at Harvard and devising ways of increasing the number of women on the faculty. Its purpose shall be to create a climate in which prejudice against women, or apathy toward their presence and future at Harvard, will be hard to maintain; it shall serve as a "watchdog" to make sure that the uttering of pious generalities is not substituted for serious efforts to hire on the basis of excellence rather than of sex.

The Permanent Committee on Women shall report publicly to the Harvard community every year on the progress of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences toward meeting the guidelines set out above. Department Chairmen shall be required to report to the Dean of the Faculty annually on the numbers of women at all levels presently in the department, including entering graduate students; on the women considered for any appointments made that year; on the relative allocation of funds and fellowships (including teaching fellowships) to men and women; and on the relative success (and reasons for lack of success) in placing male and female graduate students who desire job placement. The Dean shall supply this information to the Committee, which shall then consult directly with any department whose report is unsatisfactory. The Permanent Committee shall also require and receive, through the Dean's office, reports from the Masters of Houses, the Committee on General Education, and the head of the Expository Writing program on the numbers of women tutors in their various domains, and reports from the Harvard Board of Freshman Advisers and the Bureau of Study Counsel about the number of women on their staffs. Every five years, beginning next year, department chairmen shall be required to report to the Permanent Committee through the Dean's office the reasons why each female research associate or fellow and each female lecturer, permanent and non-permanent, in that department holds an off-ladder rather than an on-ladder appointment. Although specific complaints within the University community normally go to the Commission on Inquiry, we would expect the Commission to take up with the Committee on Women any violations of the principles set forth in this report and adopted (if they are adopted) by the Faculty. Lecturers and research associates and fellows, whose appointments

are by definition "unusual," should be able to turn to the Permanent Committee if they believe that they have been discriminated against because of their sex. Should a University-wide committee on women be established, the Permanent Committee on Women of the Faculty of Arts and Sciences should have one delegate member on it.

Faculty Appointments

Our third recommendation is simply a strong endorsement of a policy only recently announced by the Dean of the Faculty: that department chairmen should provide *ad hoc* committees on permanent appointments with "evidence that consideration was given to women . . . by including [in the materials they submit] the names received and the steps taken to ascertain potential candidates . . ." We regard this as an absolutely crucial enforcement mechanism, and would suggest that when the evidence submitted is unsatisfactory, *ad hoc* committees should themselves take an active role in trying to ascertain whether there are qualified women candidates for the open position.

In the past, the appointment of distinguished women to tenured positions at Harvard has often been blocked by certain assumptions about the personal qualities and career possibilities of academic women — assumptions that are not entirely rational or, we believe, in the best interests of the university. For example:

1. that a single woman scholar is somehow "peculiar," bluestocking, or vaguely threatening; it is not "normal" for her to pursue scholarship rather than devoting herself to husband and family.
2. that a married woman scholar is not an independent person but an appendage to her husband; she must therefore never be offered a position at Harvard if her husband is settled elsewhere. More is involved in this than the assumption that the women will not accept the offer. It is frequently assumed as well that her marriage would collapse and her husband be emasculated if the couple made a decision on the basis of her career opportunities.
3. that, since a woman may in the future decide to have chil-

dren, she is a "poor risk," and that this is so whatever she says or might say about her own plans.

4. that a woman cannot handle full-time work.

Similar assumptions have sometimes blocked the appointment of younger women scholars as assistant professors. For example:

1. that a married woman whose husband is in school is a "poor risk" because her husband may finish, find a job, and leave the Cambridge area.

2. that any married couple, when both its members are academics, will automatically take more seriously a job offer to the male partner.

3. that a woman should automatically be offered a lectureship or a research position rather than a regular faculty appointment.

Assumptions of this sort are often evident at job interviews, and they suggest a line of questioning that we regard as both discourteous and irrelevant. Women at Harvard have described to our committee interviews at which they were asked questions like these: what are your plans for marriage? do you intend to have children? (or, worse, how do you and your husband prevent having children?) who will look after your children if you have them? how long does your husband intend to remain in this area? even, why is your husband not applying for this job? Too many occasions have been reported in which the chairman or other interviewer has commented on the physical and sexual characteristics of the candidate and has not been willing or able to take her scholarly record seriously. This sort of thing might be considerably reduced if the participation of women on committees which are involved in the recruitment and selection of faculty members is increased — an increase pledged in the "affirmative action plan" submitted by Harvard to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. But we would stress that in many departments there are simply no women to participate on such committees. Nor would it be fair to impose on the few women in other departments the heavy burdens of recruitment and selection. Male faculty members must repudiate the assumptions we have described and take on the major part of the work of bringing more women to Harvard.

Something must also be said about nepotism. Harvard has no nepotism rule, but a considerable number of chairmen expressed strong objections to the appointment of a husband and wife in

the same department. We recognize and to some degree share the anxieties that underlie these objections. Yet the number of academics married to academics is clearly increasing, and cases are bound to arise where both husband and wife deserve appointment. When they deserve it, they should have it: the resulting complications can be lived with. What cannot be lived with, in our opinion, is an unwritten nepotism rule which almost invariably penalizes the female half of an academic team. Of course, when husband and wife become assistant professors in the same department, they and their colleagues must speak plainly about the possibility that only one of them will be promoted. It should also be made clear that that one might be the woman. Many couples will not seek such arrangements, or will leave unless both husband and wife win tenure; but others will seek them and will not leave. It is best if the search committee in such cases simply searches, without presuming to know what the couple will or won't do (or should or shouldn't do).

A common feature of current hiring practices which has worked against women is the grapevine system of telephone calls by chairmen to colleagues in other institutions comparable to Harvard for names of possibilities. Frequently the recipient of the call will not think of proposing a woman for Harvard, and in general women are a small minority of graduate students and young teachers at the universities to which calls are placed. Highly-qualified women tend to cluster at places outside the track of conventional Harvard contacts, at women's colleges, or teacher's colleges, or as research associates and other off-ladder appointments in major universities. On the upper levels, Harvard has a very poor record of looking at the places where women actually are; at the lower level, many Harvard departments have been remarkably consistent in hiring almost exclusively their own products when they hire women (and very few of them).

The presidents of the Seven College Conference recently undertook to explore the possibility of a roster of women scholars, with files recording age, training, field of scholarship and publications. If this roster becomes available, we hope that chairmen of all Harvard departments will grow accustomed to consulting it regularly. Indeed, this will surely happen once the Dean begins to receive from departments annual reports on women considered for faculty positions. We also urge that Harvard depart-

ments consider Radcliffe Institute scholars and older women whose careers have been interrupted much more seriously than they do at present for junior and senior faculty appointments. Harvard, like other universities, has generally assumed that assistant professorships should normally go to scholars who have just received their Ph.D.'s or completed short-term post-doctoral fellowships. But there is no reason why older women and men should not be appointed to junior faculty positions. In the few recent cases where men and women who entered academic careers in their mid or late thirties have been offered junior appointments, the result has been a happy one for the University and the individual scholar.

Part-Time Teaching

Our first three proposals, concerned with guidelines, *ad hoc* committees, and the establishment of a Permanent Committee, are intended to encourage Harvard departments to increase the number of women in tenured and non-tenured positions. Our fourth proposal, on part-time teaching, is intended to make it possible for more women to accept positions on the Harvard faculty now and in the future. There are a variety of ways to organize part-time work, and the choices we have made have been prompted largely by the hope of opening up the possibility of a "normal" career to men and women temporarily unable to work full-time. If adopted, of course, our proposals might open other possibilities as well. There are many people, for example, who might happily choose to work part-time at the university and part-time somewhere else. We understand that there are already a few members of the regular faculty who are permitted an arrangement of this sort, but we do not intend to recommend it. We shall propose only a limited number of part-time positions and would expect to see them offered to men and women who cannot work at any other rate.

At present, regular faculty appointments are not made on a part-time basis, although in many departments professors carry only a fractional part of the normal teaching load, devoting the rest of their time to research. It should be pointed out that the normal teaching load is itself intended to be a part-time responsibility. In *Privileges and Benefits Available to Officers* (Faculty of Arts and Sciences, September, 1963), the University policy is stated as ". . . a pattern of teaching duties which will enable

each individual to devote approximately half of his time to his own scholarly investigations. Levels of compensation, course loads, committee assignments, and administrative tasks are measured, roughly, against this objective." Further reductions presumably free more time; the arithmetic is not simple, since important teaching responsibilities are not reflected in the figuring of fifths, but the conclusion is reasonable enough. All this poses the problem of how to differentiate the part-time teaching that we want to propose from that which already exists. The problem is especially awkward since we are not proposing part-time teaching solely to enable women to care for their children; we want also to enable them to do research while caring for their children. There seems no good reason why that research should not be paid for, as the research of men in many departments is paid for, out of resources channelled through the university. We would, therefore, regard it as an ideal arrangement if a woman on a three-fifths time appointment could teach, for example, one class a semester, carry a fifth of tutorial, and be paid for the remaining fifth by a research center. Over such matters, however, the faculty has no jurisdiction. We can only urge the equity of the arrangement and recommend that in departments where paid time for research is normally a component of a faculty member's schedule, the chairman should make every effort to press the claims of his part-time colleagues upon the relevant research centers.

We recommend to the faculty as a whole that departments be allowed to appoint in the normal way a limited number of part-time assistant, associate, and full professors. The precise number of such appointments ought properly to be a matter of negotiation between department chairmen and the Dean, but it is not our intention that, at any given moment, more than a few members of any single department would be working on a part-time basis. With regard to assistant and associate professors, we recommend that such appointments be for the usual term, though with sufficient flexibility to permit those holding them to alter their time commitment from year to year. Thus, a young women with children might propose to teach three-fifths time during the first three years of her assistant professorship, but then shift to full-time during the remaining two; clearly she should be permitted to make the shift and encouraged to do so.

We also recommend that any female non-tenured professor

who becomes pregnant during her appointment be allowed an extension of the appointment for one year for each pregnancy, not to exceed a total of two years. This extension may occur whether or not she has gone on a part-time schedule or taken maternity leave. The request that the five year (or sometimes three year) limit for an assistant professor, or the three year limit for an associate professor, be extended must be made before December 1 of the year (normally the fourth year of an assistant professorship and the second year of an associate professorship) in which the department is required by the Dean of the Faculty to notify the non-tenured professor whether he or she will be promoted. An assistant professor who has already taken a two-year extension shall not be entitled to any extension in her associate professorship; the two-year limit is absolute. (Princeton has recently adopted a very similar arrangement, and we understand that it has been approved by the A.A.U.P.)

Aside from this two-year extension, which must be connected with a pregnancy or pregnancies during the term of the appointment, we recommend that tenure decisions be made on the same schedule as at present. Pregnancy may affect the length of an appointment, but part-time status should not. Our purpose is to enable women to maintain the continuity of their careers, to work steadily and productively, and any significant postponement of tenure decisions is not likely to serve that end. It might well create a new kind of academic limbo, populated largely by women. Though a woman's decision to raise a family while pursuing an academic career may mean that she will work at a somewhat slower pace and with greater difficulty than men of the same age group (unless the men come to play a larger part in the raising of their own children), we strongly believe that she should enjoy similar sorts of collegial support and feel similar pressures. By the end of nine or ten years, she ought to be able to finish enough work of her own so that a tenure committee can make an informed decision.

These part-time assistant and associate professorial appointments ought, of course, to carry with them all usual faculty prerogatives, including presidential leave, to be paid on the basis of the average teaching rate over the previous several years. As for unpaid leave (except for maternity leave), we are inclined to say that title to that is lost by working part-time. Indeed, our

proposal may conveniently be illustrated by describing just how it is lost: we are suggesting that *some men and women be permitted to take their unpaid leave while they work*. Present university policy permits professors to take leave one semester in four, that is, at a one-quarter time rate. If this leave were taken while teaching, it would make possible the pattern described in the example above, where a woman was imagined as working for three years at a three-fifth rate and for two years at full time. But we offer this only as a rough indication of our plan. Something like it will often, but not always, be enough to enable women to work steadily on their own research. Some women will need more time. In any case, having taken their unpaid leave, in whatever amount, they are no longer entitled to it.

Part-time tenure positions are somewhat harder to deal with, because of the workings of the Graustein formula. In principle, a man or woman who chooses to teach part-time ought to be able to switch to full-time at his or her discretion. No new departmental decision should be necessary, once the professorial appointment has been made. But departments will not always have the resources necessary to permit the switch, or, given the resources, they may feel that some new appointment is more urgent: the candidate won't wait, courses need to be taught, and so on. Obviously, considerable discretionary powers must be allowed here. It is very important, however, that women who choose to work part-time while their children are young be encouraged to become full-time members of the faculty as soon as they feel they are able. Indeed, once they have been awarded tenure, it should be regarded as their right to do so — though departments must also have the right to ask them to postpone the switch for a limited number of years (we would suggest no more than three), until the necessary money is available.

"Part-time" is an ambiguous phrase, and our report cannot touch upon all the minor difficulties that will have to be worked out if our recommendations are to be put into effect. One problem, however, has come up so often during our discussions that we must say something about it here. The phrase refers only to the allocation of teaching duties or to teaching duties and *paid* research time, but not necessarily to the allocation of administrative chores and committee work. All the members of the faculty presumably share in these last — not, in fact,

equally, but rather in accordance with their several dispositions and consciences. It is our hope that part-time assistant, associate, and full professors would share in them also and on much the same basis. But we are concerned lest they find themselves carrying the administrative load of a full-time faculty member while they are being paid only for part-time. And we are also concerned lest they be allowed to opt out of committee work altogether, imposing heavier responsibilities on the rest of the faculty. We have come across cases which fit both these descriptions. Clearly, both are to be avoided, yet there is no easy way to avoid them. Committee assignments will have to be negotiated, as they are now, and we can only urge upon chairmen and deans, first, that they involve part-time members in the work of the departments and the faculty as a whole and second, that they not over-burden them.

Lectureships and Research Fellowships

The only part-time appointments which now exist at Harvard are the lectureship and the research fellowship. The part-time positions we have recommended are not intended to replace either of these, nor do we want to deny their value both to the individuals who hold them and to the various departments in which they serve. In any case, research fellowships and lectureships are not always or even usually part-time positions. Our interviews indicated that the majority of women in these positions at Harvard are employed full-time. The flexibility such positions afford is often different from part-time flexibility. It will remain true that for many men and women lectureships and research fellowships will open career possibilities that would otherwise not exist.

We do hope, however, that, given the possibility of regular part-time appointments, a smaller proportion of women at Harvard will be found in the lecturer and research fellow category. A national study has shown that women are far more likely than men to be shunted into lectureships and research positions even if they desire to work full-time and even if their qualifications are identical to those of men offered professorships. We have indications that this has happened at Harvard in the past, and we know that in two cases the situation is now under review. While nothing we say is intended as a criticism of these

positions per se, we feel that departments must make every effort to avoid stereotyping female job candidates as lecturers or research personnel. We therefore propose that the Permanent Committee on Women review the situation of female lecturers, research associates, and research fellows every five years as outlined above.

Lectureships and the research positions are by definition "exceptional" and are negotiated between the individuals involved, their department chairmen, and the Dean. In general, these positions carry with them full fringe benefits, but one persistent complaint in our interviews has been the lack of presidential leave or sabbatical for those holding lectureships. We therefore recommend that all permanent lecturers, male and female, be eligible for sabbatical leave, and that term lecturers who have been employed for six years be entitled to a year off at one-half pay or one term at full pay in their seventh year. We have also heard complaints from research fellows and associates that they sometimes teach without compensation. We therefore recommend that the Dean of the Faculty develop guidelines on teaching that will protect research personnel, and that he publicize these guidelines to all departments. Because the problems associated with these positions are not simply problems for women, we urge that in addition to the review by the Permanent Committee on Women, the Dean of the Faculty undertake a periodic review of the status of all lecturers, research associates, and research fellows, permanent, term, and annual, and that in every case the department chairman be required to explain why the lecturer or researcher does not hold a regular faculty appointment.

Maternity Leave

Finally, we recommend that all female faculty members be entitled to unpaid maternity leave. If any one of them becomes pregnant and informs her department of that fact, she should at her request be given maternity leave consisting of relief from some or all teaching and research duties for one or two terms in a twelve month period, with a corresponding reduction or cessation of salary. During that twelve-month period, her coverage under the University's benefit plans and her other rights as a member of the faculty should continue without interrup-

tion. In addition, assistant or associate professors may be granted an extension of appointment up to two years as outlined above. We suggest that term lecturers should also be entitled to the privilege of extended appointments for pregnancy, but, since their appointments are by definition individually negotiated as to length, any such arrangements will have to be worked out between the woman, her department chairman, and the Dean, subject to review by the Permanent Committee on Women.

Conclusion

It is important to stress, at the end of this section of our report, that the recruitment of more women for the Harvard faculty remains and will remain the task of the present departments. We have sought to bring institutional pressures of various sorts to bear on departmental chairmen and search committees, so that they will look for and carefully consider qualified women candidates. We have sought to make it easier for such women to accept Harvard appointments. But our recommendations leave the hiring process essentially unchanged, in the hands, that is, of virtually sovereign departments.

We have also not seen fit to recommend the creation of a new department devoted to "women's studies" and predisposed, most likely, to fill its ranks with women. There are many subjects of special interest to women or focused in some special way on the history or the psychology or on the fictional representation of women which surely ought to be studied at the university level, but none of these seem to us likely to prosper in isolation from the study of humankind, of society, and of literature generally. Nor will these subjects by themselves form, under any intellectual scheme that we can foresee, a coherent academic discipline. We suggest, instead, that courses dealing with these and similar subjects ought to be initiated in departments where they are relevant. A small number of them appear in this year's catalogue (Social Science 144, English 960A, Social Relations 2003). Such courses not only open important fields of intellectual inquiry, they also respond, we believe, to deep student interests, especially among women undergraduates, and undoubtedly help encourage young women in the pursuit of academic careers. But these are not "women's courses" in the sense of being of interest only to them. Departments should

be on the lookout for qualified men as well as women in these areas of study, and for women, of course, in every other area too. It would not be helpful to the university or to the intellectual community generally if women were led to concentrate exclusively on subjects proclaimed (whether by men or by other women, whether for intellectual or for ideological reasons) to be peculiarly their own. Departmental hiring policies should be designed so as to prevent this from happening.

IV

WOMEN IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL

Whether one is a man or a woman, it is not easy to be a graduate student. Certainly it was once much harder for women, and in ways we have already discussed, it still is, though the years since the merger of the graduate schools have brought great improvement. Further improvement would come, as we will suggest, from completing the merger and opening all university facilities to men and women on an equal basis. A continued increase in the number of female graduate students is also, we believe, desirable. The prejudice against women, the disbelief in their possible seriousness, which we know to exist among some of our colleagues, cannot be repealed by a Faculty vote, but we do not believe that it would long survive the presence of more women like those revealed in our questionnaire — focused with what used to be called masculine determination on an academic career. Our major proposals in this chapter are aimed at matching that determination with opportunity. They have to do with two issues closely parallel to our concerns in the last chapter: the combination of graduate study with marriage and child-bearing and the securing of more and better jobs for qualified women Ph.D.'s.

Admissions and Scholarships

The number of women applying to Harvard has increased dramatically in the past decade. But it remains too low in many departments to produce what has been called a "critical mass" — a number great enough for mutual assistance and moral support. The reasons for this do not have much to do with the policies of the departments in question (which are mostly in the Natural Sciences). Undergraduate counselling is often at fault, or the fault lies earlier and deeper in the educational process. But correction is probably best begun from the top, and

we strongly recommend that those departments where the percentage of female applicants falls significantly below the university average ought to undertake programs to encourage the applications of qualified women. We have no doubt that this very modest sort of recruitment is in the interests of departments hitherto avoided by women, for the number of women in the university seems sure to increase over the next decades. Encouragement should begin at home, with our own undergraduates. There are a variety of formal and informal ways in which it might be extended to other schools. We are inclined to leave the precise methods to the individual departments, but we expect them, as has been indicated above, to report regularly to the Dean, and through him to the Permanent Committee on Women, on their recruitment efforts.

The virtual absence of women in some areas of study is balanced by their concentration in others. Women continue to concentrate in very large numbers in those departments traditionally regarded as congenial and open to them. Here again, the reasons have little to do with Harvard. But some of the results are discouraging: in several of these departments, the percentage of women applicants who are admitted is far below that of men. We see no reason why this should be so; the Permanent Committee on Women should request that such departments explain their admissions policy. This is not to say that in any given year the percentage should be identical, but over time they should be reasonably close, unless there is clear evidence, which we have not found, that the female (or male) applicants are of inferior quality.

We do not have much to recommend with regard to the distribution of scholarships and fellowships. There is some evidence, as we suggest in the first chapter, that departments are sometimes unwilling to "take risks" with first year women: as a group, women have a considerably smaller share of scholarship money in the first year than any time thereafter. This greatly adds to the burden that all entering graduate students share. They all must prove themselves, but women are assumed to have more to prove. Attrition rates are sometimes given as a reason for this assumption, but the assumption may be one reason for female attrition. We urge that all departments take steps to equalize first year scholarships.

We are uneasy about one more feature of scholarship policy.

When two graduate students receiving university assistance marry (but not when they simply live together), their stipends are cut. The assumption here presumably is that two can live (almost) as cheaply as one, but those who have tried to do so don't always agree. In fact, two single people have financial opportunities unavailable to a married couple — greater mobility, for example, and hence greater opportunity for summer jobs; inexpensive lodging in graduate dorms (the least expensive Peabody Terrace apartment is more than twice as expensive as a Harkness Common room and is not available on a contract covering only the academic year); and so on. Harvard's scholarships are usually quite modest; a married couple drawing two such would hardly live in splendor, any more than male or female roommates presently live in splendor. There is also a strong argument to be made, though we cannot make it in any detail here, for the maintenance of some sort of financial independence by married women who hope to have professional careers. Given present social arrangements and customs, it is more likely to be the wife than the husband who loses out when husband and wife are treated as a single unit with a single income. We do recognize, of course, that scholarship funds are scarce and likely to become more scarce, and we appreciate the effort to spread them as thinly as possible. In fixing the stipend of a married student, man or woman, the spouse's resources are clearly a relevant consideration. Unless there is a significant independent income, however, we would not on balance recommend the cutting of average-sized Harvard scholarships held by married student couples.

Patterns of Graduate Study

We have already discussed the difficult career choices that those academic women face who want to marry and bear children. With graduate students as with faculty members, our recommendations are aimed at making those choices easier; we do not pretend to make them unnecessary. Some women will choose to interrupt their study and bear their children between college and graduate school; they will be older when they apply to graduate school, but places should be available to them. Other women will interrupt their graduate career itself, seeking a leave of absence from the university. Still others will opt, if they can,

for part-time study for some period of time. We should note again that women at present take no longer than men to complete their dissertations and earn their degrees, but at the same time their attrition rate is somewhat higher. It may make sense to allow, and sometimes even to encourage, some women to take a little longer — especially when the only alternative is dropping out. We are inclined to agree with one department chairman who wrote:

> The problem of taking more time to finish a Ph.D. for women is the reverse of that for men. Where we fight the long Ph.D. stretch-out for men because of the morale problem, we should probably stress the possibility of a stretch-out for women, who may need that time to complete their work while having children.

We therefore recommend, first, that steps be taken to ease the way of older men and women applying to graduate school. Since it is often a problem with such applicants that their references are out of date and their grades merely memorials of some younger and perhaps different self, special efforts must be made to help them in the collection of relevant materials. Perhaps they should be asked to write a considerably longer essay than is presently required. In any case, the application form should be rewritten to take account of their problems, and departmental admissions committees should be asked to pay attention to the virtues of maturity.

We recommend, secondly, that graduate women be allowed to take up to two full years of maternity leave (one year per child) during their graduate career, and that during this time they should be considered members of the university community, entitled, having paid the relevant fees, to all the usual health and insurance benefits. Such leave should be requested three months before the term in which it is to begin and terminated on a similar schedule. At the end of the leave, the student should be reinstated in whatever fellowship or teaching position she formerly held. It should be noted that federal law presently requires that students who leave for military service be reinstated at the position and salary or stipend at which they left. We are simply recommending a policy of maternity leave which resembles the present policy for military service. In order to provide health

benefits for students who take maternity leave, we also recommend that these students not be required to withdraw and reapply.

We recommend, thirdly, that new opportunities for part-time study be made available to both men and women enrolled in the Graduate School but temporarily unable to carry the normal four course load. This proposal, like our plan for part-time teaching and research, requires careful and precise formulation.

Part-time Study

If part-time study is to be of any real help, the status of part-time student must cease to be viewed as "exceptional" or "abnormal." Part-time students must not be pushed to the periphery of the graduate student group or forced to move along even more slowly than necessary due to lack of contact with and encouragement from their teachers and fellow students. We propose that all departments develop ordinary procedures for permitting certain of their graduate students, who can work at no other rate, to work at a reduced rate. No graduate student, however, should be allowed to work at less than a two course load per term, and all part-time students should be urged to spend no more than two years working at the reduced rate. Our proposal is not intended to alter the option now available to graduate students of signing up for varying amounts of "time" while being considered full-time students. This was never intended to provide a cover for part-time study, though it has sometimes been used to do so: part-time study should be open and above-board.

Under our proposal, all graduate students would apply to the Harvard GSAS for one status, that of "graduate student." The Announcement of the GSAS would state that applications should *not* contain a discussion of whether the applicant wished to attend part- or full-time. Speculations about this matter should not be a part of admissions decisions. Once accepted, the graduate student would be allowed to petition his department for part-time study. Such permission should be granted by departments if pressing personal reasons are given, for example, health problems or family responsibilities (such as small children or severe illness at home). We would anticipate that the number of students presenting such petitions would be small. Once a graduate student is in residence it should be possible for him or her

to petition the department for transfer to part-time status or full-time status at the beginning of any semester. Part-time arrangements will be necessary only for graduate students who have not yet completed their residence requirements (16 half-courses), since the present system permits sufficient flexibility once the residence requirement is met. The maximum length of the part-time arrangements we propose would thus be four years (two years of course work at one-half time); departments should strongly urge graduate students to limit their part-time status to two years if possible, but we recognize (and departments should recognize) that in some cases the maximum of four years will be necessary.

These arrangements will, we believe, insure that students who petition for part-time status remain committed to a demanding graduate program. Rightly administered, they will also, in time, reduce the understandable fear on the part of some faculty members that part-time students will "dawdle" on their way to the degree, and, by reducing that fear, they will build the confidence of students and their sense of university membership.

In addition to recommending that there be one status, that of graduate student, we recommend that there be one financial aid policy. All Harvard fellowships and scholarships should be open to part-time students, male and female. Students, part-time and full-time, men and women, should be recommended for financial aid according to the formula of "need" and "ability" currently used by their department; the student's rate of work should effect this recommendation only in so far as a reduced course load will mean reduced tuition payment and therefore a "need" for a smaller amount of scholarship money. Currently, part-time students are not allowed to hold scholarships or fellowships, with the exception of a very small number of women who receive money from a restricted fund provided by Radcliffe. We recommend that this restricted fund be merged with general unrestricted scholarship funds, if legally possible, and that both men and women normally be allowed to hold fellowships as part-time students. We have in mind a program like that permitted by Engineering and Applied Physics to second-year students — a program that allows part-time study as a normal part of work towards a degree and provides fellowships for such study. We are aware that there are at present no part-time government fellowships and that part-time students applying for financial

aid will turn to Harvard for funds. But we do not think the sums involved will be large enough to cause a great increase in requests for financial aid from Harvard.

We recognize, of course, that departmental fellowship recommendations may be affected by the fact of part-time status. Here we can simply urge that departments not leap to the conclusion that four B+'s are more promising signs of ability or achievement than two A-'s, or even that four A's are always better than two. We would also urge, however, that students be warned that part-time status may in border-line cases make fellowship money a little more difficult to obtain.

Part-time students would, of course, pay tuition according to their rate of work. They should also pay the full health insurance fee and, if the University deems it necessary, a small fee to cover the additional clerical expense involved in making part-time arrangements.

The major practical objection to allowing some increase in the number of part-time students is the problem of under-utilization of University resources. To this, we answer that both the *Report of the Committee on the Future of the Graduate School* and the current state of the Ph.D. job market suggest that a slight reduction in the number of graduate students taught in the next five years would not be unwise. Moreover, within five or six years, admissions committees could, if it were thought desirable, predict the number of part-time students and accept a few more applicants to compensate for their presence. In certain of the sciences, where it is not possible to assign two part-time students to one unit of laboratory space, it may be necessary to have slight under-utilization of laboratory space or to restrict the number of students permitted to work part-time. But this problem, although real, will not be widespread in the University.

Opportunities in the Harvard Community

Men and women in the graduate school do not at present have equal access to important Harvard facilities nor, with the exception of teaching fellowships, to employment opportunities during their years of study. The inequality here is not programmatic; no one, so far as we know, has any justification to offer for it nor do we feel any need to make arguments against it. It should be eliminated down the line. To some extent, inequality

is a hangover from pre-merger days; to some extent, it has its origins in the separate existence of the two undergraduate colleges — about which we will have something to say in the next chapter. In any case, the immediate problems are not likely to prove difficult to resolve. Women should have equal access to housing at all cost levels and at all locations. This will probably require the merging of Harvard's and Radcliffe's responsibilities in the area of graduate housing. We understand that such a merger will require some legal working out and do not feel qualified to make more precise recommendations. Women should also have equal access to all athletic facilities. Their representation in Senior Common Rooms needs to be increased, so that they can play a larger part than they presently do in the life of the Houses and enjoy on an equal basis the intellectual and social benefits of House membership. They should be encouraged to apply for positions as Harvard freshman advisors and as counselors at the Bureau of Study Counsel. The Permanent Committee on Women should monitor all these areas and report regularly to the Harvard community until all inequality is eliminated.

We also recommend that a systematic review of all Harvard's printed matter — the admissions packet, registration forms, scholarship applications, and so on — be undertaken and that all forms addressed only or primarily to men be revised. We do not pretend that this is a major matter, but we know it is an annoyance to many women to find themselves regularly and routinely addressed as if they were not (really) there. It is ten years since merger and time for an end to such discourtesy.

Job Placement

The first job is the most crucial step for academic women. Candidates who make the transition from studying to teaching in a normal on-the-ladder position are likely to continue teaching and writing over the years. If this transition is not made successfully, the woman is likely to become a permanently marginal member of the academic community. As we have said before, Harvard's very best women students usually do not have problems about job placement. Advisors have been willing and able, by and large, to place them in good positions. The middle and lower groups of women students, however, frequently have

much greater difficulties than their male counterparts. Our recommendations will be aimed primarily at helping these groups, which constitute, obviously, the bulk of women in the graduate school.

Spurred by the current difficulties in finding jobs for their students, departments throughout the university are beginning to develop new placement procedures. The old protege system and the informal grapevine are giving way to more open and systematic attempts to promote departmental candidates. We find this heartening; for groups like women, so often discriminated against in the academic world, are more likely to be overlooked in a catch-as-catch-can placement system. Therefore, we recommend the following model for departmental job placement, based in part on programs now in operation at Harvard.

1. There should be a departmental placement officer or officers — persons particularly cognizant of the problems involved in placing women — who will assist students looking for jobs by collecting reports of job openings, by taking the initiative and "advertising" candidates, and by advising students before job interviews.

2. All notices of available jobs received by departmental officers or by individual professors that can possibly be made public should be made public, turned over to the placement officer and kept on file in the departmental office. All students should have access to this file.

3. Departments should consider ways of taking the initiative in finding jobs — by holding informal parties at professional conventions, for example, or by sending out a general mailing giving *vitae* of all students looking for jobs.

4. Placement officers should be prepared to help women candidates seek adjustments in any offers they receive which do not provide the salary or status that a man in their position might reasonably expect.

5. The department chairman or placement officer should report annually to the Dean, and through the Dean to the Permanent Committee on Women, on the placement record for all candidates.

We also recommend to departments the current policy of the Appointment Office in responding to discriminatory job requests. The office sends to any school announcing a job opening limited to males or to females a letter stating that its facilities

are available only to schools prepared to commit themselves to equal employment practices.

The further problems of job placement lie, so to speak, in the minds of men: we must say something again about those rarely articulated assumptions about professional women that so many men hold. Placement officers and individual advisors must beware of reducing the range of opportunities available to their women students by acting as if women (especially married women) need jobs less than men (especially married men) or are less ambitious then men; or as if women are interested only in part-time work or are suited only for off-ladder appointments; or as if women are most fit to assist on faculty research projects rather than to initiate work of their own; or as if women would do best to teach in women's colleges, or as if married women are tied to their husband's job location or should only be put forward for jobs where their husbands have or can get offers. As for the first of these assumptions, the need for a job clearly cannot be (and so far as men are concerned, is not) measured chiefly in financial terms. Were it so measured, people of independent means would be at the bottom of every list of candidates. Some of the other assumptions may be true of specific individuals, but we should wait to be told before we assume them of anyone we know.

Placing married women in jobs involves some special considerations. Some of these women will want to be very explicit to their prospective employers about how they intend to coordinate their academic and family commitments. Others feel strongly that this is entirely a personal matter. Some women are seeking jobs only in certain geographic areas or only on a part-time basis; others are ready to consider any attractive job opportunity and to make private familial arrangements. It seems to us important that placement officers and advisors should be aware of a woman's attitude on such matters and be careful to present her to the world in accordance with her own choices.

Finally, we should note that job placement is important not only for the women involved, but also for the university, and especially so in light of our recommendations in the last chapter. If Harvard is intent on increasing the numbers of women on the Faculty, one of the most promising first steps is to place its female students in good jobs. Those that are placed well now will serve as a pool for hiring five, ten, or fifteen years from now

(a pool not only for Harvard obviously). Because job placement into and from Harvard relies so heavily on personal contacts, the more female faculty members Harvard has, the easier it will be to place its female students; and the better female students are placed, the larger the pool to recruit from. The process is circular, and it is best simply to begin going around.

V

A NOTE ON UNDERGRADUATE EDUCATION

We are not empowered to make formal recommendations to the Faculty with regard to undergraduate education. Some general reflections and specific suggestions seem warranted, however, by our work these past months. Precisely how Harvard and Radcliffe Colleges are to be associated remains an open question in the community, despite its temporary settlement by the two corporations. Our own proposals point, though only indirectly, toward an eventual merger, without in any way committing the Faculty to that goal. Our proposals also point toward increases in the number of women undergraduates, if only because new women on the Faculty and in the graduate school are likely to take an active interest in admissions policy. Reforms can and often ought to be narrowly limited in their effects, but the reforms we are urging will not be so limited as to leave the college unaffected. We must try to say something about how undergraduate education will be affected, and why it ought to be.

Despite the growth of the graduate schools since World War II, the college continues to fix the general ambience of university life. Until very recently, that ambience was clearly hostile to women. The hostility was sometimes programmatic and overt, as in their exclusion from Lamont (only a few years ago, women instructors teaching classes in Lamont were asked to use the side door), sometimes more subtle, as in the general sense, which few Radcliffe students escaped, which we have heard described again and again, that women were strangers and interlopers at the very school where they were receiving their education. For it is a decisive fact about Radcliffe that it had and has no faculty; its students receive a Harvard education and now a Harvard degree. And yet the Harvard faculty is not responsible for them (except in the classroom) in the same way as it is for Harvard students. The effects of this curious arrangement were most

visible in the houses, before the present experiment in co-residential living was initiated. The isolation of women at Radcliffe, the concentration of tutors at Harvard inevitably made for separate and unequal educational experiences. In the Harvard houses, the close relation of tutors and undergraduates is important for both: it reinforces the tutor's sense of being a teacher, involved in the major work of the university; it provides undergraduates with a clear sense of a possible future in the academic world. In the past, women have missed out on both sides of this interaction. As graduate students, despite the merger of the graduate schools, they have been virtually excluded from the houses; as undergraduates, they have lived at Radcliffe. Co-residential living has begun to change this — there has been a major increase in the percentage of women tutors at the co-residential houses — and this is one of the strongest arguments for the continuation and expansion of the new living arrangements and for any changes in admissions policy that are necessary to their success.

Indeed, given the present tutorial program, co-residence is probably the only way to open equal opportunities for male and female teaching fellows — a fact which suggests very clearly the interconnections of the various levels of the university. We do not believe that Harvard can continue to be half co-educational; the expansion of opportunities for women in graduate study and teaching will push us to assume full responsibility for the education of women undergraduates. And we must alter whatever existing legal or conventional policies are incompatible with that responsibility. It is inexcusable, for example, that undergraduate women should not be eligible for the major awards and prizes distributed each year by the Faculty to its best students. Each year women are among the best students, but they cannot be singled out, honored, and encouraged to continue their studies as men can be and are. Travelling fellowships are not available to them, though the year abroad made possible by a Shaw or a Sheldon has often been invaluable in preparing a student for graduate study here at Harvard or elsewhere. There is no good reason for all this, though an explanation for it can be found in the history of Harvard as a man's college and in the records of the bequests it has received. This history probably poses no insurmountable barrier to the eligibility of women, though there will be work for the lawyers before it is surmounted. Some of the prizes and fellowships, we note, are

limited not to men but simply to "students at Harvard College." It might well be best simply to recognize that there are now female students at Harvard College, as there are at Harvard University.

One of the arguments against full integration of this sort relates directly to our work, and requires some comment. Full integration means the establishment of a single admissions policy, and this in turn means that over time the ratio of women to men will slowly increase. But as this happens, it is said, what might be called university "productivity" will decrease. One rationale for the present male/female ratio, that is, has to do with the larger percentage of men than of women who go on to noteworthy careers in business, government, and the professions. We strongly doubt that this argument is at all relevant to questions of undergraduate education; our interest in undergraduates lies less with their careers than with their minds and characters. In any case, our committee is charged with finding ways of increasing the percentage of women who do go on to noteworthy careers, at least in the academic world. Insofar as we and similar committees at other universities succeed, the argument, such as it is, evaporates. When there are more women on the Faculty, there will also be more women aspiring to be on the Faculty (and on other faculties); and those that are here will certainly take an interest in increasing the number of women among their students and in encouraging them in their career hopes and plans.

Doubtless, the present pool of educated women is quite large enough to permit a significant increase in the number of women on the Harvard Faculty. Once that increase occurs, however, and probably if it is to occur, we are bound to revise our expectations as to what women can and will achieve at all levels of intellectual life. And then admissions policy must be reconsidered. Without attempting such a reconsideration here, we do wish to put on record our own view that women should be admitted for undergraduate study as they are admitted to the graduate school, in free and open competition, and with no institutional arrangements like those presently in force — which amount in effect to a quota system. As new opportunities open, we would expect to find heightened ambition and achievement among women at all educational levels. The admissions machinery ought to be able to reflect this change as it occurs, in a normal and quiet way.

One final point must be made about the implications of the

current Harvard-Radcliffe relationship for the work of our committee. Under the new contract, which is to take effect June 30, 1971, a Dean or President of Radcliffe retains administrative responsibility for the Radcliffe Career Counseling Office, the Radcliffe Institute and Research Center, the Schlesinger Library, the Radcliffe Alumnae Office, and admissions to Radcliffe College. This Dean is "expected to take a special interest in initiating and extending educational opportunities for women under [the Faculty of Arts and Sciences]." In the past ten years, the President of Radcliffe has been a major advocate, not only to the Harvard community but also to the nation, of the need for increased educational opportunities and more flexible career patterns for women. The creation of the Radcliffe Institute in November of 1960 represented an imaginative effort to find a solution to the problems of women whose careers had been interrupted or who had chosen part-time careers for portions of their lives. We would expect and urge that the Radcliffe Dean continue to explore and support new educational opportunities for women, and that the Radcliffe Institute continue not only its support to female scholars but also its research into the problems of careers for women in our society.

The most basic conclusion of our study, however, is that Harvard's responsibility for the education and employment of women extends or ought to extend far beyond anything that falls directly under the jurisdiction of the new Radcliffe Dean or President. It would be a great mistake if the Harvard community came to see the existence of the Radcliffe Dean as Harvard's "solution to the problems of women," thus absolving Harvard departments and professors of the obligation to act. The final responsibility for increasing the number of women who are educated for professional careers and encouraged to enter them, and for increasing the number of women who hold Harvard professorships, lies not with the Dean of Radcliffe or the Radcliffe Institute, but with the admissions, scholarship, appointments, and tenure committees of individual Harvard departments. And as this responsibility is assumed, whatever reasons there once were for the separate existence of a women's college will vanish: at some point in the near future, we are convinced, Harvard can and should become a fully co-educational university.

VI

UNIVERSITY SERVICES

According to a vote of the Faculty in June, 1970, the central functions of the university are learning, teaching, research, and scholarship. The point is indisputable. But any community of men and women rapidly takes on peripheral functions, and the precise range and extent of these has never, so far as we know, been the subject of a Faculty vote. Housing, health care, disability insurance, retirement benefits; all these have long been provided by the university even though the university does not exist in order to provide them. Day care for children — our major concern in this chapter — can probably be added to the list; a number of centers at Harvard and Radcliffe are now receiving one or another sort of official assistance. There is an important argument that can be made against this sort of thing, in favor either of individual or state provision. The university, it is often said, must avoid becoming an "enclave" whose members receive all necessary services and are freed from the responsibilities of citizenship and association elsewhere. We recognize the force of this argument; yet it obviously applies in different degrees to different sorts of services.

For certain services, the place of study or employment is the natural focus of organization. Health care, for example, must be provided by the university, at least to students, since they are living away from home, are temporary residents in the local community, are often minors, and cannot be expected to provide for themselves. Were it not for the special situation of students, there might well be no reason or no sufficient reason for the university to provide health care for its adult members and employees — though that is a benefit few of us would willingly relinquish — let alone for their dependents, as the Committee on University Health Services has recently proposed.

The argument for some sort of university assistance to day care centers seems to us a good deal stronger, even if it does

require the university, as the present health services do not, to recognize that its members often have families. Day care is more directly relevant to the concerns of the university, since it is so closely tied up with the ability of a significant number of university members to work and study on a regular basis. Moreover, it seems especially important to locate day care centers at or near the place of parental employment: this reduces transportation problems and makes it possible for parents to spend time with their children during the day and to reach them quickly should the need arise. During World War II, day care centers were established at many factories where women worked, and this is a practice that will almost certainly have to be imitated, if increased numbers of women are to teach at the university.

Health Care

Before suggesting an expansion of the university enclave, however, we must look at the most important form of provision (after student housing) within it. Harvard undoubtedly has one of the best university health services in the country. Like many other features of university life, however, the UHS seems to have been designed without sufficient attention to the special needs and concerns of women. It may well be the case, as UHS officials suggested at our open hearings, that the complaints we then heard derive almost entirely from a lack of adequate communication between health service policy-makers and Harvard and Radcliffe women. We cannot, however, simply recommend improved communication: having held hearings and conducted interviews, we feel bound to put on record some of the things that obviously need to be discussed — and to begin the discussion with some very tentative recommendations of our own.

There appear to be four general areas of complaint. First, the health center does not provide regular gynecological services, though it does provide a variety of medical services for which there seems likely to be less call. Only very recently was a consulting gynecologist brought onto the staff of the UHS. Although staff internists can perform routine gynecological examinations, women must still visit doctors outside the health center for more specialized gynecological care, and they must pay for it. And yet there are surely enough women presently

in residence to provide economic justification for the employment of one or more gynecologists (the center at MIT, where there are far fewer women, employs two), and even if there were not, we should have thought it a matter of ordinary courtesy, once women were admitted to university membership, to provide them with a form of medical care so particularly necessary to them.

Secondly, there has been a great deal of confusion over the proper method of obtaining maternity benefits on a Blue Cross-Blue Shield insurance policy. The requirements here are not set by the UHS; they seem a little odd, requiring as they do that university women insure their husbands as dependents; and perhaps the UHS ought to lobby against them. In any case, it should not be so hard as it apparently has been to publicize them to the community.

Thirdly, there have been problems with the distribution of birth control information, occasioned in part by Massachusetts law, but also, it appears, by an unnecessary reticence, awkardness, or hostility on the part of some members of the UHS staff. Legal problems must be dealt with by lawyers. But the general policy of the UHS is a matter of legitimate community concern. We recommend the policy adopted by the Department of University Health at Yale, which has created a special clinic to deal with the sexual questions and problems of Yale students.

Fourthly, some feeling exists, how widespread we cannot tell, that female psychiatric patients are sometimes ill-served because of rigid preconceptions as to their proper life role held by certain doctors. We have not attempted any investigation of this matter; nor are possible negative views on the part of psychiatrists toward professional women likely to be revised in the light of committee recommendations. It would seem prudent and wise, however, if those persons choosing psychiatric consultants for the UHS searched out doctors, male and female, likely to be sympathetic to the difficulties of professional or would-be professional women.

Day Care

Day care already exists at Harvard and Radcliffe; it has developed and is developing very gradually, the product largely of parental initiatives and administrative helpfulness. We have

little more to urge than further development along lines that already seem roughly marked out. If more centers are to be established, however, the lines will have to be drawn more clearly and precisely: it will become necessary for the university to make its own (limited) financial contribution more definite than it has been until now, to provide general guidelines for day care at the university, and to co-ordinate and oversee the various efforts. All this can be done, we believe, with relative ease and little expense; nevertheless, the decision to do it will represent a major step toward improving the status of women at Harvard.

We have no clear idea how great the demand for day care presently is. A very high percentage of male and female graduate students with children indicated in responding to our questionnaire that they would find university centers helpful and would use them even if they had to pay for them (see Appendix 2A). On the other hand, recent meetings aimed at setting up centers at Harvard have drawn only small groups of parents. Although the number of children under five years of age in the families of married students, officers, and employees is large (no recent figures are available; see Appendix 2A for children of graduate students) the university is presently under very little serious pressure. The centers now in existence had vacancies at various times this past year. If the general outline of a university day care policy is to be designed in tranquility and with adequate forethought, this is clearly the time to do the job.

The day care program that we design should, of course, be beneficial for children as well as helpful for parents. It is good day care, not merely convenient day care, that parents (presumably) want. The two centers already in operation at Radcliffe are good examples of the sort of day care on a small scale that has been developing at the university. Lyman Center at Currier House, under the direction of Professor Jerome Bruner, has a capacity of 16 children; the age range (as of Fall, 1970) is ten months to four years. The center is staffed by a Radcliffe graduate who is a trained kindergarten teacher and by two assistants with masters degrees in education. Volunteer workers from Currier House supplement this staff. Radcliffe provides the space and pays for utilities and insurance; the only costs that need to be met by the center itself are salaries, supplies, and lunch and snacks for the children. Parents pay these costs at a rate of $30/week for a full day, $20/week for a half day. There

is a sliding scale for children of employees. The rates are the same at the Radcliffe Gymnasium preschool, where the college again pays for space, utilities, and so on. This center takes care of 25 children whose ages range from 2½ to 5 years. A head teacher and two assistants run the center; one of the several volunteer workers is using the experience for a project at the Graduate School of Education.

We believe that the best system of day care for Harvard — the most feasible as well as the most desirable — would involve a number of such small centers with a capacity of about 15–25 children each. These centers could be set up in the university's residential units, where they would, as Dr. Bruner says, "be treated as a natural part of the community's activities." Or they could be set up by voluntary associations of parents wherever facilities exist: the gymnasium preschool is an example, as is the center now being started in the Sunday School rooms of Memorial Church. In a small center, the problems of staffing and budgetting would be minimized, younger children would not be overwhelmed by a large impersonal setting, and the suggestions of parents with regard to their own children and to matters of general policy could be given due consideration. Despite their size, such centers would be able to care for more than twenty-five children, since few parents would need to use them for forty hours a week; many might need day care only half-time or even for only a few hours a day.

In order to facilitate this pattern of organization, we propose that Harvard appoint an administrator of child care, whose task it would be to coordinate and assist the various programs. The administrator should choose a consulting committee, including members of the medical and education faculties and parents from the existing centers, with which he or she should work out general guidelines and minimal standards for day care at Harvard and assess the centers periodically. Within these limits, however, we hope that parents would have a substantial say in running the centers. The primary purpose of the university administrator should be to help them set up the sort of centers they want. There is no need for the centers to be identical in either policy or program. The administrator should provide information about state and city requirements for the physical lay-out of day care centers, about necessary insurance levels, about university facilities, catering services, purchasing powers,

personnel, and so on. His duties need not be limited to day care centers; alternative methods of child care, such as baby-sitting and play groups, might also be encouraged.

The initiative in setting up a center would most often come, we expect, from parents with eligible children, but it might also come, for example, from a housemaster and a Senion Common Room with available space. In either case, the group would apply to the administrator, who would coordinate its efforts with those of other groups, suggest possible sources of money and staff, and explain the guidelines. He would not do the work, however: time and energy must come from the interested group.

So must most of the money: we would expect the major financial burdens of day care to be borne by parents — through fees, volunteer fundraising, and so on. However, some university contribution seems justifiable, as part of a general commitment to open up opportunities for women in academic life. We therefore propose, first, that the university assume responsibility for the provision of space, utilities, and liability insurance (as Radcliffe has done for its two centers) for those centers operating within the guidelines and approved by the administrator and the consulting committee. And we propose, secondly, that a university fund be established for the support of day care centers in their early stages. We have studied the budgets of a number of centers presently operating in the Boston area and concluded that a center charging parents the standard rates mentioned above should become self-supporting after a few months of operation. An initial outlay of several thousand dollars is necessary, however, in order to provide salaries for the teachers and a starting stock of supplies. Alumnae and other patrons of the university could contribute directly to the Child Care Fund that would provide this money; we strongly urge that the university itself make the first contribution. After that, any center that made a profit would be expected to return money to the Fund. We also propose that as the university plans for the future, new buildings should be designed, whenever possible, to include space that could be used for day care.

The mandate of our committee is to discover ways of increasing the participation of women in the Faculty of Arts and Sciences. Our discussion of a possible system of day care centers has therefore focused on the value of the system for scholars and potential scholars. But child care is a need common to many

women, indeed, to many men, as health care is a need common to all human beings. The Health Services, established for students have, as we noted above, been extended to all members of the University community. We would expect that the model we have suggested for day care would also be applicable to employees, whose need for such services in order to work is at least as great (and possibly greater) than that of women faculty and graduate students. The existing day care centers at Harvard and Radcliffe are all open to employees, students, and faculty. If the initiative is left with parents, as we have suggested, future centers will probably include all sectors of the University community. The Child Care Fund or other Harvard funds might be used to reduce fees for low-income students or employees, or this might be left to the several centers; recommendations on these matters are outside the mandate of our committee.

VII

SUMMARY OF PROPOSALS

Above all, Harvard University should hire more women: most of our proposals are designed, directly or indirectly, to make that possible.

1. The Harvard Faculty should strive to achieve a percentage of women in its tenured ranks equal to the percentage of women receiving Ph.D.'s from Harvard ten years ago (9.6% in 1959–60) and a percentage of women in the non-tenured ranks equal to the percentage of women receiving Ph.D.'s from Harvard today (19% in 1968–69).
2. A Permanent Committee on Women consisting of five members of the Harvard Faculty of Arts and Sciences should be appointed by the Dean of the Faculty and charged to survey periodically the status of women at Harvard and suggest ways of increasing the number of women on the faculty.
3. *Ad hoc* committees considering permanent appointments should require evidence that consideration was given to women by departmental search committees.
4. Departments should be allowed to appoint in the normal way a limited number of part-time assistant, associate, and full professors.
5. Any female non-tenured professor who becomes pregnant during her appointment shall be allowed an extension of the appointment for one year for each pregnancy, not to exceed a total of two years.
6. Any female faculty member should be entitled to unpaid maternity leave, consisting of relief from some or all teaching and research duties for one or two terms in a twelve month period, with a corresponding reduction or cessation of salary. During that twelve-month period, her coverage under the University's benefit plans and her other rights as a member of the Faculty should continue without interruption.

7. All permanent lecturers should be eligible for sabbatical leave, and term lecturers who have been employed for six years should be entitled to a year off at one-half pay or one term at full pay in their seventh year.
8. The Dean of the Faculty should develop guidelines on teaching designed to protect research personnel, and he should publicize these guidelines to all departments.
9. The Dean of the Faculty should periodically review the status of all lecturers, research associates, and research fellows, permanent, term, and annual.
10. New opportunities for part-time study should be made available to students enrolled in the Graduate School of Arts and Sciences but temporarily unable to carry the normal four course load.
11. Those departments in which the percentage of female applicants falls significantly below the university average should undertake programs to encourage the applications of qualified women.
12. Departments should insure that first-year graduate women have equal access to scholarship aid.
13. The application form for the Graduate School should be rewritten so as to take account of the problems of older men and women applying to graduate school.
14. Graduate women should be allowed to take up to two full years of maternity leave during their graduate careers, during which they should be considered members of the university community, entitled, having paid the relevant fees, to all the usual health and insurance benefits.
15. Graduate women should have equal access to graduate student housing at all cost levels and all locations, and to all athletic facilities.
16. The representation of women in Senior Common Rooms should be increased and graduate women should be hired as Harvard freshmen advisers and as counselors of the Bureau of Study Counsel.
17. Departments should adopt a placement procedure like the model suggested in Chapter IV, designed to insure, so far as possible, equal opportunities for women on the job market.
18. The University should undertake a systematic review of all its printed matter, and all forms addressed only or primarily to men should be revised.

19. The University should appoint an administrator of child care to coordinate and assist the various day care centers now in operation or established in the future. The administrator should choose a consulting committee to work out general guidelines and standards for day care at Harvard.
20. The University should assume responsibility for the provision of space, utilities, and liability insurance for those centers operating within the guidelines and approved by the administrator and the consulting committee.
21. The University should establish a Fund for the support of day care centers in their early stages.
22. The University Health Services should hire enough gynecologists to provide for the health needs of the women in the university community.
23. The University Health Services should establish a clinic to provide whatever information on birth control can be legally provided, and to deal with the sexual questions and problems of Harvard and Radcliffe students.
24. The Dean of the Faculty should seek to establish a committee to study the position of women employed by the Corporation but not holding faculty appointments.

APPENDIX 1: STATISTICAL TABLES

TABLE I

WOMEN IN SELECTED CORPORATION APPOINTMENTS
UNDER THE FACULTY OF ARTS AND SCIENCES:

March, 1969–70; December, 1970–71

Title	(March) 1969–70 Total	Women	(December) 1970–71 Total	Women
Regular Faculty				
Full Professors	444	0	453	2
Associate Professors	39	0	38	0
Assistant Professors	195	10	184	11
Instructors	18	3	11	2
Teaching Fellows	1027	226	1058	236
Other Faculty				
Lecturers (total)	233	36	204	34
Permanent			33	10
Term			35	2
Annual	166	29	136	22
Research				
Senior Research Associates	3	1	11	1
Research Associates	63	11	137	16
Research Fellows	397	51	321	43

TABLE II

HARVARD UNIVERSITY OFFICERS, MALE AND FEMALE APPOINTMENTS: 1959–60; 1968–69

Title	1959–60 Total	Male	Female	% Female of Total	1968–69 Total	Male	Female	% Female of Total
Corporation	7	7	0	0	5	5	0	0
Board of Overseers	32	32	0	0	30	30	0	0
Officers of Instruction								
University Professors	5	5	0	0	5	5	0	0
Professors	424	420	4	.94	580	577	3	.5
Associate Professors	126	118	8	6.3	151	143	8	5.3
Assistant Professors	207	199	8	3.9	401	384	17	4.2
Research Professors and Assistant Research Professors	2	2	0	0	3	3	0	0
Clinical Professors, Associate and Assistant Clinical Professors, and Clinical Associates	236	228	8	3.4	357	340	17	4.8
President and Professors Emeriti	157	155	2	1.3	184	175	9	4.9
Lecturers	224	196	28	12.5	406	356	50	12.3
Visiting Professors and Associate Professors, Visiting Lecturers, and Visiting Associates, Consultants, Critics and Fellows	107	104	3	2.8	158	149	9	5.7
Associates	117	112	5	4.3	235	211	24	10.2
Instructors	571	519	52	9.1	791	722	69	8.7
Tutors	57	56	1	1.6	75	71	4	5.3
Teaching Fellows	673	597	76	11.3	1296	1091	205	15.8

79

Research Associates, Research Fellows and Assistants, and Members of Research Staffs	876	796	107	12.2	1530	1286	244	15.9
Assistants	332	288	44	13.3	385	317	68	17.7
Miscellaneous Academic Appointees	232	221	11	4.7	371	326	45	12.1
Officers of Administration								
Deans, Executive Officers, Syndics and Masters	141	123	18	12.8	167	126	41	24.6
Directors, Library Officers and Curators	298	230	68	22.8	469	327	142	30.3
Health Services	84	79	5	6.0	137	126	11	8.0
Athletic Administration and Coaches	32	32	0	0	33	33	0	0
Proctors and Freshman Advisers	166	166	0	0	98	96	2	2.0
Board of Preachers	7	7	0	0	6	6	0	0
Business Officers	31	30	1	3.2	91	79	12	13.2
Miscellaneous Administrative Appointees	13	8	5	38.5	103	83	20	19.4
Radcliffe Trustees and Administrative Appointees			—	—	118	30	88	74.6

75

80

TABLE III

WOMEN IN THE HARVARD GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES: APPLICATIONS, ADMISSIONS, REGISTERED STUDENTS, TEACHING FELLOWS, AND PH.D. RECIPIENTS:

1959–60; 1968–69

	1959–60				1968–69			
	No. Men	No. Women (Radcliffe)	Total	Percent Women	No. Men	No. Women	Total	Percent Women
Applications	2818	872	3690	23.6	4653	1679	6332	26.5
Admitted	1267	365	1632	22.3	1408	460	1868	24.6
Registered (new students)	685	174	859	20.3	597	226	823	27.5
Registered (all resident students)	1749	394	2143	18.4	2237	653	2890	22.6
Holders of Teaching Fellowships	486	69	555	12.4	898	213	1111	19.2
Total receiving Ph.D.	303	32	335	9.6	372	87	459	19.0

TABLE IV

FEMALE APPLICANTS, ADMISSIONS, AND ENTRANTS TO
THE HARVARD GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES:

1967; 1968; 1969 (Three Year Totals)

Department	Number of Applicants	Percent of Applicants Who Are Women	Percent of Applicants Who Are Accepted		Percent of Those Accepted Who Enter		Percent of Entrants Who Are Women
			W	*M*	*W*	*M*	
SOCIAL SCIENCES							
Anthropology	342	25	36	44	46	58	30
Business Economics	101	7	14	23	100	60	8
Economics	1502	10	15	18	55	48	10
Education	130	15	15	13	100	71	23
History	1404	22	26	24	59	41	30
Hist. & FEL	39	18	14	27	100	75	10
Hist. & MES	23	17	25	11	—	50	—
Hist. of Amer. Civ.	252	29	14	18	40	40	24
History of Science	79	14	55	46	50	46	18
Anthro. & MEL	9	45	100	80	25	50	33
Pol. Sci. & MEL	18	22	25	57	100	25	33
Pol. Econ. & Gov.	94	11	—	12	—	60	—
Government	1578	19	10	14	61	54	15
Regional Stud. E. Asia	592	31	40	41	45	53	30
Regional Stud. M. East	120	44	50	58	45	49	39
Regional Stud. S. Union	215	27	45	55	43	55	19
Religion	496	14	22	19	73	67	16
Clinical Psychology	364	36	8	9	64	71	32
Social Anthropology	109	43	32	44	60	52	40
Social Psychology	514	26	12	22	70	58	29
Sociology	562	27	21	21	55	53	30

28

TABLE IV — 2

Department	Number of Applicants	Percent of Applicants Who Are Women	Percent of Applicants Who Are Accepted		Percent of Those Accepted Who Enter		Percent of Entrants Who Are Women
			W	*M*	*W*	*M*	
HUMANITIES							
Celtic	40	40	44	50	86	67	44
City & Reg. Plng.	105	5	40	21	100	76	11
Classics	333	37	43	42	45	65	39
Comparative Lit.	358	52	7	17	68	42	52
English	1741	37	20	25	56	42	39
Far East. Lang.	165	28	44	43	48	51	27
Fine Arts	554	58	13	35	62	64	38
German	194	42	60	43	42	42	52
Linguistics	196	43	48	45	48	40	52
Music	177	29	47	59	50	49	25
Near East. Lang.	185	20	54	46	30	55	14
Philosophy	548	17	20	18	45	38	21
Romance Lang. & Lit.	835	61	46	24	42	69	64
Sanskrit & Indian Stud.	36	28	40	43	75	45	27
Slavic Lang.	204	56	33	42	64	52	54

TABLE IV — 3

Department	Number of Applicants	Present of Applicants Who Are Women	Present of Applicants Who Are Accepted		Present of Those Accepted Who Enter		Present of Entrants Who Are Women
			W	*M*	*W*	*M*	
NATURAL SCIENCES							
Applied Mathematics	40	13%	80%	77%	50%	48%	13%
Astronomy	159	12	37	39	43	41	12
Biochemistry & Mol. Bio.	254	28	18	35	54	22	19
Biology	455	35	33	26	53	55	35
Biophysics	91	16	50	44	100	41	33
Chemical Physics	87	14	42	44	60	61	13
Chemistry	679	15	16	33	72	53	9
DEAP	1231	6	46	42	62	45	8
Forestry	9	11	—	63	—	60	—
Geology	173	11	74	78	43	30	14
Mathematics	513	11	17	24	70	43	13
Medical Sciences	373	44	38	37	66	58	48
Physics	641	6	28	26	18	29	3
Psychology	329	30	27	26	54	31	43
Statistics	117	21	68	62	59	36	33

TABLE V

FEMALE SCHOLARSHIP RECIPIENTS AMONG ENTERING STUDENTS
IN THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES:

1967; 1968; 1969 (THREE YEAR AVERAGE)

DEPT.	(A) Number registered as 1G (average year)		(B) Percentage of scholarship applicants		(C) Percent of (B) who received a firm offer of scholarship		(D) Percent of (C) who accepted firm offer	
SOCIAL SCIENCES	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Anthropology	16	7	68	32	48	27	72	67
Economics	36	4	89	11	73	86	45	33
Business Economics	4	2	100	—	80	—	50	—
Education	3	1	75	25	100	100	100	100
Government	23	7	87	13	73	62	60	60
History	36	15	76	24	52	64	33	57
HFEL	2	—	100	—	67	—	100	—
History of American Civ.	4	1	83	17	80	50	50	—
History of Science	4	1	78	22	86	50	67	100
Political Econ. & Gov.	1	—	100	—	50	—	100	—
Regional Studies E.A.	27	15	75	25	33	17	83	50
Regional Studies M.E.	7	4	57	43	83	78	50	43
Regional Studies S.U.	14	5	70	30	27	37	72	67
Religion	17	4	80	20	88	100	57	50
Social Relations	31	11	76	24	62	54	54	71
TOTAL	219	67	78	22	61	55	55	51

	(E) Percent of TOTAL firm offers		(F) Percent of TOTAL offers accepted	
All Scholarships - - -	83	17	80	20
Harvard Scholarships -	79	21	79	21

TABLE V—2

DEPT.	(A) Number registered as 1G (average year)		(B) Percentage of scholarship applicants		(C) Percent of (B) who received a firm offer of scholarship		(D) Percent of (C) who accepted firm offer	
HUMANITIES	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
City and Reg. Planning	5	1	83	17	80	100	75	100
Classics	12	7	74	26	60	43	42	67
Celtic	3	2	60	40	100	100	67	50
Comp. Lit.	6	3	73	27	64	75	86	100
English	38	33	71	29	60	56	58	70
Far Eastern Lang.	7	3	63	37	67	57	62	75
Fine Arts	14	8	72	28	56	43	90	67
German	9	6	59	41	46	78	67	56
Linguistics	7	5	62	38	78	62	60	80
Music	11	4	80	20	83	100	60	67
Near Eastern Lang.	12	2	81	19	46	67	67	50
Philosophy	11	2	76	24	87	80	43	50
Romance Lang.	17	31	50	50	64	55	57	50
Sanskrit	2	1	67	33	50	100	100	100
Slavic	6	7	60	40	100	100	50	63
TOTAL	191	113	68	32	68	64	60	65

	(E) Percent of TOTAL firm offers		(F) Percent of TOTAL offers accepted	
All Scholarships - - -	68	32	66	34
Harvard Scholarships -	68	32	65	35

TABLE V—3

DEPT.	(A) Number registered as 1G (average year)		(B) Percentage of scholarship applicants		(C) Percent of (B) who received a firm offer of scholarship		(D) Percent of (C) who accepted firm offer	
NATURAL SCIENCES	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
Applied Math	4	1	80	20	75	100	33	—
Astronomy	7	1	87	13	69	50	45	100
Biochemistry	10	2	87	13	65	67	54	—
Biology	19	8	70	30	52	58	60	43
Biophysics	4	2	90	10	100	100	45	100
Chem. Physics	6	1	90	10	56	—	45	—
Chemistry	33	3	93	7	58	50	60	50
DEAP	66	6	96	4	95	67	47	50
Forestry	2	—	100	—	100	—	100	—
Geology	11	2	92	8	56	100	46	—
Mathematics	14	2	91	9	74	67	65	50
Med. Sci.	16	7	52	48	100	91	58	70
Physics	22	2	97	3	36	100	72	100
Psychology	6	4	72	28	44	57	62	100
Statistics	6	4	85	15	64	50	57	100
TOTAL	226	45	88	12	67	61	56	67

	(E) Percent of TOTAL firm offers		(F) Percent of TOTAL offers accepted	
All Scholarships - - -	88	12	87	13
Harvard Scholarships -	88	12	85	15

87

TABLE VI

WOMEN HOLDING TEACHING FELLOWSHIPS:

1970–71

Division	Appointments Male		Appointments Female		Enrolled 1970–71 Male	Enrolled 1970–71 Female
	No.	%	No.	%		
Social Sciences	207	(78)	59	(22)	78%	22%
Humanities	164	(69)	75	(31)	69%	31%
Natural Sciences	293	(86)	46	(14)	84%	16%
Gen. Ed.	190	(76)	61	(24)		
Social Studies	15	(79)	4	(21)		
Hist. & Lit.	25	(78)	7	(22)		
TOTAL	894	(78)	252	(22)		

TABLE VII

MALE AND FEMALE TEACHING FELLOWS: TENTHS OF TIME EMPLOYED BY FIELDS

1970–71

	Tenths of Time Employed:				
Field	.2	.3	.4	.5	.6
Social Sciences					
Male					
Number	107	39	40	12	9
Percent	52%	19	19	6	4
Female					
Number	32	11	14	2	0
Percent	54%	19	24	3	
Humanities					
Male					
Number	63	31	63	4	3
Percent	38%	19	38	3	2
Female					
Number	28	7	38	1	1
Percent	38%	9	51	1	1
Natural Sciences					
Male					
Number	149	107	9	28	0
Percent	51%	36	3	10	
Female					
Number	23	17	1	5	0
Percent	50%	37	2	11	

N.B. These figures represent the fall and spring term teaching fellow appointments recorded with the GSAS office as of March 2, 1971. When all spring term appointments are recorded the proportion of T.F. time for the average student will change and the male-female distribution might change slightly.

TABLE VIII

MEDIAN NUMBER OF YEARS ELAPSING BETWEEN B.A. AND RECEIPT OF PH.D.

1950–1954; 1960–1964; 1965–1967

Field of Ph.D.	1950–1954						1960–1964						1965–1967					
	Harvard/ Radcl.		Selected* Sample		All Institutions		Harvard/ Radcl.		Selected Sample		All Institutions		Harvard/ Radcl.		Selected Sample		All Institutions	
	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	M	W	M
Phys. Sci.	5.4	5.8	6.7	6.5	6.9	6.4	6.4	6.2	6.3	6.7	6.8	6.7	6.0	6.4	6.3	6.5	6.5	6.5
Biol. Sci.	9.3	6.1	7.5	6.7	7.9	6.8	6.2	6.4	8.8	7.6	8.8	7.7	6.4	6.4	7.2	7.3	7.5	7.4
Soc. Sci.	8.8	9.4	10.1	8.3	10.2	8.4	7.5	8.2	10.8	9.1	10.7	8.8	8.1	8.1	9.5	8.2	9.7	8.0
Arts & Human.	13.5	9.5	13.2	11.0	13.4	10.6	8.9	8.9	12.1	10.4	11.7	10.0	8.2	8.0	11.9	9.9	11.0	9.4
Education	21.5	14.9	26.0	13.6	26.9	14.2	11.4	11.8	24.0	12.7	25.6	12.7	19.0	11.4	23.5	13.6	21.7	13.7
Other	a	11.3	15.0	11.4	14.2	11.1	b	10.5	22.4	10.8	15.2	10.7	c	11.9	33.1	10.9	15.1	10.9
TOTAL, ALL FIELDS	9.5	8.5	12.0	8.4	11.8	8.1	8.0	8.0	12.3	8.7	12.1	8.5	8.1	7.9	11.2	8.1	10.9	8.0
N–	158	1630	2084	17, 565	3615	35, 020	247	1836	3092	22, 705	6596	54, 593	214	1275	2911	18, 637	6771	50, 400

a. 1 Person
b. 2 Persons
c. 4 Persons

Source: NAS Survey of Doctorates in United States, Printout Sheets

* 17 institutions (excluding Harvard), all of which were major producers of Ph.D.'s between 1920 and 1966, and all of which awarded more than 8% of their Ph.D.'s to women between 1960 and 1966.

68 89

TABLE IX

RATIO OF PH.D.'s AWARDED TO GRADUATE ENROLLMENT BY SEX, BY DEPARTMENT AND AREA: HARVARD GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS AND SCIENCES

1965; 1966; 1967 (THREE YEAR AVERAGE)

Combined Ratio, All Departments: Men 6.6 Students enrolled per Ph.D. Awarded; Women 10.1

	Natural Sciences			*Social Sciences*			*Humanities*		
	Dept.	Enrollment/ Ph.D.'s Men	Women	Dept.	Enrollment/ Ph.D.'s Men	Women	Dept.	Enrollment/ Ph.D.'s Men	Women
*Large Departments**	Biology	5.9	7.6	Economics	5.3	5.8	English	6.5	7.5
	Chemistry	5.4	4.7	Government	6.4	12.1	Romance Lang.	6.1	11.3
	DEAP	7.8	7.7	History	5.1	5.1			
	Physics	7.1	14.0	Social Relations	5.6	6.3			
Other Departments	Anthropology	6.2	7.1	City & Reg. Planning (Com.)	4.9	2.0	Classics	5.2	25.0
	App. Math. (Com.)	6.5	**	Education (Com.)	11.3	13.0	Comparative Lit.	7.7	19.3
	Astronomy	11.8	13.0	History & F.E.L. (Com.)	7.8	11.0	Far Eastern Lang.	15.0	**
	Biochemistry and Molecular Biology (Com.)	6.4	6.0	History of American Civ. (Com.)	4.4	**	Fine Arts	8.3	17.9
	Biophysics (Com.)	9.9	**	History of Science	8.8	11.0	German	5.9	24.5
	Chemical Physics (Com.)	5.6	3.0	Political Economy and Government (Com.)	2.1	0.5	Linguistics	7.8	13.3
	Geology	4.7	**	Study of Religion (Com.)	6.2	9.5	Music	9.2	**
	Mathematics	7.6	**				Nr. Eastern Lang.	9.9	**
	Medical Science	7.5	7.3				Philosophy	5.9	6.7
	Psychology	8.3	2.6				Sanskrit	3.5	**
	Statistics	4.3	4.7				Slavic Lang.	7.2	17.4
Area Total: Natural Sciences		6.7	7.2		6.2	8.9		6.9	13.8

* Large Departments are arbitrarily classified as those with an average graduate enrollment of 90 or more students.
** No Ph.D.'s were awarded in these groups.

Source: H. Doermann, "Baccalaureate Origins and the Performance of Students in the Harvard Graduate School of Arts and Sciences."

TABLE X

MALE AND FEMALE HOUSE TUTORS:

1970–71

Harvard Houses	*Resident Tutors*	*Non-Resident Tutors*	*Students* (Approx.)
Adams	M–12 F–1	M–20 F–4	M–250 F– 60
Dudley	M– 5 F–0	M–20 F–6	Not Coed
Dunster	M–11 F–2	M–18 F–7	M–235 F– 55
Eliot	M–10 F–2	M–28 F–3	Not Coed
Kirkland	M–10 F–0	M–16 F–1	Not Coed
Leverett	M–13 F–2	M–26 F–1	Not Coed
Lowell	M– 9 F–2	M–21 F–4	M–300 F– 65
Mather	M–12 F–0	M– 9 F–1	Not Coed
Quincy	M–13 F–5	M–39 F–7	M–215 F– 77
Winthrop	M–12 F–3	M–32 F–8	M–259 F– 55
Radcliffe Houses			
South House	M– 4 F–4	M– 2 F–3	F–260 M–130
North House	M– 4 F–1	M– 4 F–3	F–270 M– 98
Currier House	3 Married Couples M– 4 F–6 Non-Resident Affiliates: M– 4 F–13	M– 8 F–1	F–300 M–100

APPENDIX 2: QUESTIONNAIRES

2A: Graduate Student Questionnaire
2B: Graduate Alumni/Alumnae Questionnaire

APPENDIX 2: QUESTIONNAIRES

Much of the material in Chapter I of our report derives from two questionnaires, one to graduate students currently enrolled, the other to all members of the entering graduate classes of 1950, 1957 and 1964. The replies to these two questionnaires provide extensive and fascinating information about the expectations, achievements, and problems of female graduate students and young women academics; they also provide information about the composition of the GSAS and the careers of its students and graduates, both male and female, in the past twenty years. We cannot discuss in detail the full range of data collected. But we repeat here the concluding sentence of our introduction to the Graduate Student Questionnaire: "The statistical data produced by this questionnaire will be made available upon request to persons or groups within the University interested in these problems." And we would welcome further study of the material we have collected.

2A: *Graduate Student Questionnaire*

This questionnaire was mailed to all female graduate students currently enrolled in GSAS (743) and to one-third of the male students (750 out of 2250). We received responses from 344 (46%) of the women, of whom 144 were married, and from 352 (47%) of the men, of whom 149 were married. Male and female respondents distributed among the fields of graduate study roughly in proportion to the percentages of males and females actually enrolled in these fields, except for the fact that relatively few males enrolled in the Humanities responded.

In general, as we argue in Chapter I, the replies indicate that male and female graduate students are surprisingly alike in background and in abilities. Harvard graduate students, male and female, come from similar undergraduate backgrounds. Similar percentages of men and women attended non-coed undergraduate schools, ranked in the top 5% of their classes, won academic honors, special prizes, and traveling fellowships. About 45% of the women and 55% of the men did not have a single female pro-

fessor, tenured or non-tenured, in college. As we had expected from the testimony of Radcliffe students about their experiences, fewer of the women had been encouraged to attend graduate school by their professors: 63% of the women (and only 38% of the men) answered that no professor had encouraged them to seek graduate training.

In personal background also, male and female graduate students are strikingly similar. Roughly the same percentage of men and women in our sample are married; the same percentage (about 10.5%) have children. Both the men and the women seem in general to come from middle to upper middle class backgrounds. Over one-third of the men and women list their parents' level of education as "graduate or professional degree." 25% of male and female respondents come from families with incomes between $15,000 and $25,000, 22% from families with incomes of $10,000 to $15,000, and 13% from families with incomes of $25,000 to $50,000. Slightly more of the men listed their family's income as between $5,000 and $10,000 and slightly more of the women listed family incomes above $50,000. Similar percentages of men and women had mothers who were employed while they were growing up. But, just as female students received less encouragement from their teachers in college, so female graduate students receive less encouragement from families and peers. Even more striking is the fact that female students feel much less positive reinforcement from families and peers for their decision to pursue a career than for their decision to pursue graduate study.

In the objective facts of graduate school experience, men and women are again very similar. Almost exactly the same percentage (25%) of the respondents took a break between undergraduate and graduate school. For only 4% of the sample was the break longer than five years, although this group includes slightly more women. Slightly more women (15%) than men (10%) have interrupted their graduate careers, although only 4% have interrupted study for more than two years. The pattern of support is also very similar for men and women: 27% of those responding list Harvard fellowships as their primary source of support, 34% list outside fellowships, 14% list teaching fellowships, 9% list spouse's job; 20% of male and female respondents have borrowed money to support graduate study and 41% hold jobs.

The difference in male and female experience in graduate school lies in the realm of attitudes and expectations. Women are, as we state in Chapter I, at least as career-oriented as men. Despite this fact, however, women receive less encouragement from families, friends, and undergraduate teachers. And, when they reach graduate school, they not only meet little encouragement; they also sometimes face open hostility. We have discussed, in Chapter I, the replies to several questions about graduate school atmosphere which indicate that female students are frequently told either that they personally are not seriously committed to graduate study or that women in general are not committed, that they personally will fail on the job market or that women in general are unable to gain job placement. Moreover, although women perform as well as men in graduate study, they do not receive the same encouragement and are not subjected to the same pressure to excell. The same percentage of female as of male respondents (41%) have been urged by faculty members to publish a specific piece of research, but considerably fewer women than men have been urged to publish in general. Female graduate students feel that the faculty attitude toward them is less favorable than toward male students. In response to the question "How do you think faculty members, when dealing with academic issues, treat graduate students in each of the following categories," about 25% of the total respondent group answered "slightly worse than average" or "much worse than average" for the categories "women," "single women," "married women," and "married women with children," while only 2% gave such answers for "men," "single men," or "married men," and only 3% gave such answers for "married men with children." Moreover the women are, predictably, more sensitive to such a discouraging atmosphere than are the men: 28% of the female respondents and 16% of male respondents, for example, answered "slightly worse than average" for the category "women;" 24% of the women and 15% of the men answered "slightly worse than average" for the category "married women with children," and 12% of the women and 6% of the men answered "much worse" for the same category.

Conventional wisdom, which was not infrequently reflected in our letters from department chairmen, holds that women have difficulties in academic careers not because they are women but because they marry, follow their spouses, and bear children. By

and large, however, the replies to our questionnaire indicate that women experience prejudices because they are women, not because they are married. A correlation of many of the questions we asked about expectations and atmosphere revealed more of a difference between married and single men than between married and single women. A slightly smaller percentage of married (42%) than of single women (48.5%) felt that their thesis advisers would recommend them for an assistant professorship in a good liberal arts college, a slightly larger percentage of married (52%) than of single women (48.5%) felt that an adviser would recommend them for an assistant professorship in a major university. But the only significant difference revealed by these questions is that 61% of the married men as opposed to 47.6% of the single men felt that a thesis adviser would recommend them for an assistant professorship in a major university. For whatever reason, being married is a far more important correlate for a man than for a woman, although in so far as it makes a difference for a woman it in general correlates negatively whereas for men it always correlates positively. A cross correlation of the percentage of those who want "very much" to teach in a high status university with those who think they are likely to do so indicates that 30% of the single women who want to think they are likely to, 26.5% of the married women who want to think they are likely to, 26% of the single men who want to think they are likely to, but 53% of the married men who want to think they are likely to.

There is some evidence in our questionnaire results suggesting that, while an atmosphere of prejudice weighs equally heavily on single and married women, married women encounter more specific career obstacles than single women. 10% of single women and 5% of single men have been told by a faculty member that they would not be recommended for a job in a high status university, whereas 16% of the married women as opposed to 4% of the married men have been told this.

As we discussed in Chapter I, the questionnaire also revealed quite clearly those aspects of Harvard which female students would like changed in order to eliminate prejudice. More than one-half of the female respondents would find more women on the faculty and more women in tenured faculty positions "extremely helpful," while another 30–35% would find this "helpful." About 40% of the female respondents strongly desire

more women in the administration. Between 50% and 60% of the female respondents felt that a birth control clinic at the University Health Services and the addition of gynecologists to the staff would be "extremely helpful." More than one-quarter of the women strongly desired formal arrangements for part-time study in the first year and unlimited coed housing at Harkness, and 30% more of the sample would find such new arrangements "helpful." Women expected less help from complaint bureaus than from changes in Harvard policies and from the addition of more women to the faculty. Only 15%–16% of the women replied that they would find a university-wide board to hear complaints about sex discrimination or a departmental board or adviser "extremely helpful," although 50% felt that a university-wide board would be "helpful."

Both quantified and open-ended answers to our questionnaire reveal that women and men in the graduate school strongly desire university-sponsored day care arrangements. 38% of the female and 35% of the male respondents would find day care centers at Harvard paid for by parents' fees "helpful," and 31% of the female and 24% of the male respondents would find such centers "extremely helpful." 18% of the female and 22% of the male respondents would find free day care centers at Harvard "helpful," and 47% of the female and 37% of the male respondents would find such centers "extremely helpful," but about 12% of the sample would disapprove of free day care whereas only 4% disapprove of day care with parents' fees. Out of 250 answers to an open-ended question on optimum day care arrangements, 30% of respondents volunteered a description of free or Harvard-subsidized day care and over one-third went to considerable trouble to describe the kind of day care wanted. About 25% of those replying to this open-ended question stressed the need for a center that would be open long hours and would have places for children to be left in emergencies.

Even more indicative than these general responses, however, are the replies from graduate students with children. 10.5% of our sample (36 women, 37 men) have children (116 children), of whom about two-thirds are pre-school. The questionnaire replies thus suggest that the graduate school population has more than 500 children, about 330–350 pre-school. 18 women (or one-half of those with children) listed children as one of three reasons for slow progress toward the degree. Only 4.1% of graduate

students with children currently use day care arrangements (which are very scarce in Cambridge); 25% use a paid baby-sitter in the home, 21% use a paid baby-sitter outside the home; 11% have children in school. 43% of parents would find day care centers supported by parents' fees "helpful" and 33% would find them "extremely helpful;" 22% would find free day care "helpful" and 56% would find it "extremely helpful." One-half of the parents in our sample of an open-ended question on day care wanted day care subsidized completely or in part by Harvard.

The discrepancy between desires and expectations for female respondents to this questionnaire is far less striking than the discrepancy between the expectations described here and the experiences of the women revealed in the replies to the alumni/alumnae questionnaire discussed below. Female graduate students currently enrolled have experienced prejudice and hostility, yet remain firmly career-oriented — possibly more so than their male counterparts. Some of them expect to advance less rapidly or less far than they desire, but, by and large, they expect to contribute in important ways to scholarship and teaching; and they clearly deserve to be helped to do so.

2B: *Graduate Alumni/Alumnae Questionnaire*

This questionnaire was mailed to all entering students, male and female, in the graduate classes of 1950, 1957, and 1964. We received responses from 672 alumni, 27% of the members of the three classes. Of these 575 (86.6%) were men and 97 (14.4%) were women. Since fewer than 10% of the students in GSAS during the 1950's were women, this respresents a somewhat higher return from women than from men. Our sample is also slightly biased in that a greater proportion of the female than of the male respondents come from the class of 1964 — a fact which helps account (but does not wholly account) for the statistics below.

By and large, the responses reveal a pattern that we had been led to expect from a variety of national studies and also from a study of Harvard and Radcliffe graduate alumni undertaken by Dean Elder in 1958. Virtually the same percentage of women as of men continue in academic life after beginning graduate study. But they move along somewhat more slowly to the

Ph.D. (more recent figures, cited in the text of our report and in Table VIII, suggest that this is changing), are far more likely to interrupt their studies, spend more time at the bottom of the academic ladder or get pushed into marginal jobs. Partly as a result of their career interruptions, they earn much less money and also publish fewer books and articles. Of our sample, 47% of the women and 70% of the men had attained a Ph.D. as of December, 1970; 28% of the women and 10% of the men expected their doctorates within the next two years; 34% of the men and 19% of the women had published at least one book and 74% of the men and 49% of the women had published at least one scholarly article. The statistics on present employment and approximate salary shown in the accompanying tables are perhaps the most discouraging, though they are at least partly explained by the fact that 36% of the women (and only 2% of the men) have been unemployed at some point in their careers. Of this 36%, almost half gave "family responsibilities" as a cause for their unemployment and about one-third listed "restrictions as to place of residence."

Present employment: Graduate classes of 1950, 1957, 1964

	Full Prof.	Assoc. Prof.	Asst. Prof.	Lect. or Instruct.	Other	No Answer
Men	21%	16	19	4	27	13
Women	1	8	22	16.5	28	25

Approximate present salary (in thousands of dollars)

	under 7	7–9	9–11	11–15	15–20	20–30	over 30	No Answer
Men	.2%	4	9.6	25.9	21	22.6	6.4	10
Women	4.0%	18.6	21.6	17.5	4	0	0	34*

* Apparently a considerable number of women working part-time did not answer this question, probably because the category "under 7" did not appear on our questionnaire (as it should have); a few respondents wrote it in.

In assessing their own careers, one-third of the women respondents thought that they had been hindered in their careers because of marriage and family responsibilities. Just under one-quarter felt that they had been descriminated against because of their sex. One-quarter thought that they would have been helped in their careers had part-time academic positions been

available to them; another quarter thought they would have been helped by university provision of day care; about 10% indicated an interest in part-time graduate study. Since these last groups do not have the same members, we are led to hope that the proposals we have put forward would enable a substantial number of women like those in our sample to pursue more productive and rewarding careers.